

वीर सेवा मन्दिर दिल्ली



कम सत्या

कानून

सर्व

AL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

T FOR 1945-1948

ident

C. I. E. T. D. Governor of Bombay

Presidents

(b) B. A. C. B. E., Rajasabab of Aundh

amanrao alias Appasabab Patwardhan
K. C. B. I., Rajasabab of Sangli

so alias Nanasabab Naik Nimbalkar
Raja Bahadur of Phaltan

karrao alias Babasabab Pandit

Pant Sachiv Rajasabab of Bhor

... ..

Sir G. D. Madgaonkar I.C.S. (Retd.)

Dr. Sir R. P. Paranjpye M.A. D.Sc.

N. C. Kelkar Esq. B.A., LL.B.

REGULATING COUNCIL for 1945-1948

Chairman *

or mant Balasabab Pant Pratimdbi B. A. C. B. E. Pajasabab of Aundh

Vice-Chairman *

Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit M.A. F.R.A.S.B.

Prof K. V. Abhyankar M.A.
Dr A. S. Altekar M.A. LL.B. D.Litt
Dr V. M. Apte M.A. Ph.D.
Dr P. V. Bapat M.A. Ph.D.
† Dr V. G. Bhat M.A. Ph.D.
Prof N. G. Damle M.A.
Prin S. V. Dandekar M.A.
Dr. S. K. De M.A. D.Litt
Prin D. R. Gadgil M.A. M.Litt
Mm Prof P. V. Kane M.A. I.L.M.
Prof R. D. Karmarkar M.A.
Dr Mrs Irawati Karve M.A. Ph.D.
Mr. N. C. Kelkar B.A. LL.B.
Prof R. D. Laddu M.A.
Honble Mr Justice N. S. Lokur

B.A., LL.B.

Mm Prin V. V. Mirashi M.A. LL.B.

Dr V. G. Paranjpye M.A. LL.B.

D.Litt

Mm Prof D. V. Potdar B.A.

Prof R. D. Vadekar M.A.

Prof H. D. Velankar M.A.

Joint Trustees

Sardar G. N. Majumdar C.I.F.

Diwan Bahadur K. M. Jhaver

M.A. LL.B.

EXECUTIVE BOARD for 194-48

Prin J. R. Garapure B.A. LL.B.

(Chairman)

Dr R. N. Dandekar M.A. Ph.D.

(Secretary)

Prof R. G. Bhadkamkar M.A.

(Treasurer)

Rao Bahadur Dr S. K. Balvalkar

M.A., Ph.D.

Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit M.A.

† Prof A. B. Gajendragadkar M.A.

M.B.E.

† Dr S. M. Katre M.A. Ph.D.

† Dr M. B. Rehman M.A., Ph.D.

Dr P. L. Vaidya M.A. D.Litt

*To be elected annually

† Nominated by Government

CONTENTS

VOLUME XXVI, PARTS III-IV

(24-6-1946)

ARTICLES

- Ancient Historic Sites of Bengal by Dr H. C. Law,
M.A., B.L., Ph.D., D.Litt. ... 177-191
- An Unnoticed Aspect of Gaudapāda's Māndūkya
Kārikās by Dr P. T. Raju, M.A., Ph.D. ... 192-200
- Notes on a Few Words by Bimalacharan Deb,
M.A., B.L. ... 201-215
- Studies in the History of Hindu Festivals—some
notes on the History of Divālī Festival—(between
C. A. D. 50 and 1945) by P. K. Gode, M.A. ... 216-262
- Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law by Prof
Dr. Ludwik Sternbach (Poland) 263-282
- III. Mahābhārata Notes by V. S. Agrawala, M.A. ... 283-297

MISCELLANEA

- Bhāṣasālika or Bhāṇḍasālika? by Lokesh ... 293
- A Note on the A. Chester Beatty Collection by
G. H. Khare ... 299-300
- Vaiśyas and Social Order by S. N. Tadpatrikar,
M.A. ... 301-306
- An Opening Verse of the Mahābhārata by B. N.
Krishnamurti Sarma, M.A. ... 307-312
- Authenticity of the Kṛṣṇacarita by Jagan Nāth, M.A. 313-318
- A New Interpretation of the expression गिलाघनमप्रस्थ-
प्रदीपसहस्रकथन, in Samkara's commentary on Br.
Sū I, ii. 23 by Shrinivas Dixit, M.A. ... 319-321
- Books Received ... 322-323

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

VOL. XXVI]

JULY-OCTOBER 1945

[PARTS III-IV

ANCIENT HISTORIC SITES OF BENGAL

BY

B. C. LAW

Bengal contains many ancient historic sites and it is not possible to give a detailed account of them in the following pages. I shall therefore deal with some of them as briefly as possible.

Visnupura: Visnupura is in the Bankura District in west Bengal. It is a centre of music culture. For many centuries it had been the capital of the Malla rājās who gave the name of Mallabhūmi or the land of wrestlers to the country ruled by them. The Mallabhūmi comprised the whole of the modern district of Bankura and parts of the adjoining districts of Burdwan, Midnapore, Manbhum and Singhbhum. Ādi Malla was the first king who was noted for his great skill in wrestling and archery. Raghunātha who was the founder of the Malla dynasty of Visnupura was born while his parents were on their way to the sacred temple of Jagannātha at Puri. He defeated the neighbouring chiefs of Pradyumnapura (in the Joypore Police Station) which he made as his seat of government. The royal ensign of the rulers of Mallabhūmi bore the device of a serpent's hood because Raghunātha is said, according to tradition, to have been shaded by two huge cobras with their hoods spread over his head. The cobra's hood carved in stone is even now worshipped in that place under the name of Dandēsvari. The Hindu rājās of Visnupura were the rulers of a great portion of western Bengal long before the Mahommedan conquest by Bukhtiar Khilji.

Jagat Malla, a ruler of Visnupura, removed the capital from Pradyumnapura to Visnupura. The Rājās of Visnupura were Śiva¹-worshippers. The temple dedicated to Malleśvara Mahādeva which is considered to be the oldest shrine, is still found there. The rājās afterwards became the ardent worshippers of Mrpmayī (an aspect of *śakti*²) whose temple still stands there. The worship of Dharma³ which Ramāi Papdit⁴ introduced, became very popular at Visnupura. The celebrated Bengali Mathematician Śubhamkara Rāya lived under the Malla kings who were great patrons of learning.

The city of Visnupura is named after the god Visnu. Visnu was the deity of the royal house at the time of Bīr Hāmīr in the 16th century A. D. who was a great supporter of Vaisnavism. The large stone-gateway of Visnupura fort and the great cannon call *Dalmardan* may be attributed to him. Many Vaisnava manuscripts were received by him and in quest of them, Śrinivāsācārya came to Visnupura.

The magnificent temple of Rāsmañca was built by Bīr Hāmīr. Among the later shrines, mention may be made of the following :

Temples of Śyāma Rāi, Kālācānd, Murali Mohan, Madan Gopāl, Madan Mohan, Rādhā Śyām, Laljeu and Jodbānglā

The temples of Visnupura are mostly square buildings with a curved roof having a small tower in the centre. Some of them have towers in four corners of the roof. The temple is called *Pañcaratna*, i. e., five towered or *Nava ratna* or nine towered. The Śyāma Rāi temple is one of the oldest temples of the *Pañcaratna* type in Bengal. Some of the temples at Visnupura contain scenes from the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata* on their walls.

¹ Śiva is the third god of the Hindu Triad, the other two being Brahmā the Creator and Viṣṇu, the preserver, the destroying and reproducing deity (creator, destroyer and regenerator).

² Active power of a deity.

³ Dharmadeva, God of Justice.

⁴ Author of the *Śūnya Purāṇa* and *Śūnya pūjāpaddhati*. He was an exponent of Dharma cult in Bengal. Some hold that doggerel verses were composed soon after the Mahammedan conquest. He was a contemporary of Dharmapāla II who reigned in Gauḍa at the beginning of the 11th century A. D.

Susunia hill. Another site of historic importance in the district of Bankura is the village of Pokhrana or Puskarapa on the Dāmodar river, about 25 miles east of the Susunia hill, which was the seat of administration of a ruler named Candravarman as far as can be gathered from an inscription on the hill.

Kenduli: It is a village also called Kendva Billa or Jaya-deva Kenduli in the Bolpur thana of the Suri sub-division in the Birbhum district. It is situated on the north bank of the river Ajay, a few miles west of Ilambazar and about 22 miles south of Suri. It is famous as the birth place of the great Sanskrit poet Jayadeva who flourished in the 12th century A. D. He composed the well-known *Gita Govinda*, a Sanskrit lyrical poem, in praise of Rādhā & Kṛṣṇa. The body of Jayadeva was buried and not burnt after his death and his tomb still stands at Kenduli. In the middle of January, a fair is held every year in his honour.

Tāmralipti (Tamluk): Tāmralipti (Tamluk) is situated in the district of Midnapore. Tāmralipti or Damalīpti is called a city of Suhma according to the *Daśakumāracarita* (Chap. V). The Epics, Purāṇas and Buddhist works mention this town. It was a great maritime port and an emporium of commerce from the 4th century B. C. to the 12th century A. D. The temple of Bārga-Bhīmā mentioned in the *Brahmapurāṇa* which was an ancient vihāra (monastery) now exists in the town. The temple of Binduvāsini was situated at Tāmralipti which was visited by the Chinese pilgrims Fā-Hien in the 5th century A. D. and Hiuen Tsang in the 7th century A. D. This temple has been mentioned by Dandi in his *Daśakumāracarita*, who flourished in the 6th century A. D. Hiuen Tsang saw a *stūpa* (dagoba) of Aśoka near this town. I-tsing, another Chinese pilgrim, resided here in the Barāha monastery. The present temple of Hari is said to have been built some 500 years after the destruction of the ancient temple of Binduvāsini by the action of a river (Rupanārāyana).

Navadvīpa: The present railway station of Navadvīpaghat is 8 miles from the town of Kṛṣṇanagar in district of Nadia. To the west of this place, on the other side of the Ganges, stands the town of Navadvīpa, which is a sacred place of

the Vaisnavas.¹ It is so called because it is a combination of nine islands. It is the birth place of Caitanya who was born here in 1485. He preached the doctrine of *universal love* (love to all beings). Buddha also preached it. So did Mahāvira—love, love towards the suffering and distressed world, love towards the happy and love towards the criminals. At the age of 24, Caitanyadeva, the great founder of new Vaisnavism in Bengal, left Navadvipa and lived the life of a hermit. Ballālasena is said to have built a palace here and the ruins of this palace, known as Ballāladhipi (400 ft long and about 30 ft high) are found on the eastern coast of the Ganges, half a mile to the north of the present Māyāpura, as some portions of this Dhipi on the west side have been washed away by the Ganges. A court of justice was established there by Aśokasena, grandson of Lakṣmanasena and great-grandson of Ballālasena. At one time it was a great centre of Sanskrit learning and the home of many learned men, e. g., Bāsudeva Śārvabhauma, (a well-known logician), Raghunātha Śiromaṇi (an exponent of new logic in Bengal), Raghunandan Bhaṭṭācārya (the founder of the Dāya-bhāga School of Hindu Law), and Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamabāgiśa (a tantric scholar). Four learned men e. g., Halāyudha, Paṣupati, Sūlapāni and Udayanācārya (philosopher) flourished during the time of Lakṣmanasena. It is still a sacred place to the Hindus.

Śāntipura : In the district of Nadia stands Śāntipura on the Ganges. It is the abode of the celebrated Vaisnava reformer Advaitācārya, a contemporary and admirer of Śrī Caitanyadeva, an incarnation of Śiva and Viṣṇu. It contains the temples of Madanagopāla, Madanamohana, Kālācānd, Syāmacānd, etc. Here the celebrated teacher Advaita used to practise penances.

About four miles from Śāntipura stands the present village of *Phuliyā* which is nine miles from Rānāghāt and fifty-four miles from Calcutta. It is the birth place of the celebrated Bengali poet Kṛttivāsa, the author of the Bengali *Rāmāyana*. The well-

¹ A sect in Bengal founded by Caitanya who was regarded by his followers as an incarnation of Kṛṣṇa. His chief doctrine is the duty of *bhakti* or love.

known Muslim follower of Caitanyadeva, Yavana Haridāsa, spent his days here in religious practices. To quote Kṛttivāsa—

“ *Grāmaratna Phuliyā jagatē bākhān:
Daksine paścime vahe Gaṅgūlarangini* ”

It was prosperous at the time of Kṛttivāsa when the Ganges flowed on its south and west. It reminds one of the famous lines written on the memorial pillar raised at the site.

Hehā dṛṣṭavan!

ādi Kari Bāṅgālar

bhāṣā Rāmāyanakāi

Kṛttivāsa labhātā janam !

Surabhita sukavitoe

Phuliyār punyatirtho

He puthuk, sambhrame pranama !!

The sum and substance of these lines is this “ Oh traveller ! respectfully bow down before this sacred place of Phuliyā where was born the composer of the Bengali *Rāmāyaṇa*, who was the best of the Brahmans and the foremost of the poets.

Plassey · The Palasi Railway Station in the district of Nadia is 93 miles from Calcutta. The famous battle-field of Plassey is about 2 miles to the west of the Railway Station. The name of this place is derived from the Palāsa trees (*Butea Frondosa*) which were plenty there. The British under Lord Clive defeated the army of Siraj-ud-daula, the last independent Muslim ruler of Bengal in the mango-grove of the historic battle-field on the 23rd June 1757 A. D. This battle has been ably described in verses in the Bengali language in the famous book of Nabin Chandra Sen, *Palāśir Yuddha*. About 4 or 5 miles from Palāśi, we find the tomb of Mir Madan,¹ the General of Siraj-ud-daula.

Ādi-Saptagrāma · The remains of ancient Saptagrāma are found near the present railway station called Ādi-Saptagrāma, about 27 miles from Calcutta. Saptagrāma was an important city and a port. It is so called because the seven sons of king Priyavrata became sages after practising penances there. This place is

¹ The poet describes his death thus ·

*chuṭila ekṣi gōḷā raktima varan
vṛṣam lūṅila pāye sei sāṅghātik ghāye
bhūtale haia Mīr Madan patan* !

He fell in the battlefield after having received a serious wound in his leg.

frequently mentioned in the mediaeval Bengali texts, e. g. *Caṇḍimaṅgala* of Makundarāma, *Manasāmaṅgala* of Bipradāsa, *Caṇḍi* of Mādhavācārya. It is also mentioned in the *Pavanadūtā* written by Dhōyī, the court poet of Lakṣmanasena. It lost its importance as a port owing to the silting of the river-bed of the Sarasvatī. In the 9th century A. D. Saptagrāma was ruled by a powerful Buddhist king named Paramabhaddāreka Śrī Śrī Rūpnārāyaṇa Sinha. The Egyptian traveller, Ibn Batuta, came here in the 13th century A. D. Saptagrāma, the metropolis of Rādhā or western Bengal was later conquered by Jafar Khan whose tomb is still found at Trivenī. Many coins of Muslim rulers, e. g., Sher Shah and Husen Shah have been found here. During the rule of Alauddin Husen Shah of Gauda, it was called Husenābād and was the seat of an imperial mint. In the 16th century A. D. a Hindu chief named Rājvalocana conquered it from Sulaiman, the Sultan of Gauda. It is the birth-place of the author of the *Caṇḍi*.¹ We get a glimpse of its prosperity from Bankimcandra's *Kapālakuṇḍalā* and H. P. Shastri's *Bener Meye*. It is a sacred place of the Vaiṣṇavas being the home of Uddhārana Datta, a follower of Caitanyaadeva. Nityānanda, the right-hand-man of Caitanya, spent many years in this locality. A mosque and a few tombs are still found here.

Vamsavāṭī : It is in the district of Hooghly where there are three temples of Viṣṇu, Kālī (Svayambhava) & Hamsesvari (an aspect of Durgā). The temple of Viṣṇu is the oldest. The temple of Hamsesvari was built in 1814. Close to Vamsavāṭī there is a sacred abode of Uddhārana Datta, a celebrated Vaiṣṇava disciple of Caitanyaadeva. It is very much frequented by the Vaiṣṇavas specially on the anniversary day of this religious reformer.

Trivenī : It is five miles from the present Bundel Junction Station. It is a sacred place of the Hindus, situated at the confluence of the Sarasvatī and the Bhāgirathī. The site is ancient as it is found mentioned in Dhōyī's *Pavanadūtā*, a work of the 12th century A. D. The Muslim historians call it Tīrpāṇī or Fīrozābād as Fīroz Shah, Sultan of Bengal, lived here for some time. During the Muslim period it was an important city and a

¹ . It describes the greatness of Durgā. (*Devīmāhātmya*).

port. The mediaeval Bengali poet Mukundarāma mentions it as a sacred place, much frequented by the pilgrims.¹ It was once a centre of Sanskrit learning. Here we find the tomb of Jafar Khan, the conqueror of Saptagrāma, and close by there is a mosque with the maxims of the *Holy Quoran* written on it. The tomb of Jafar Khan was built over a Hindu shrine containing some inscribed scenes from the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*.

Mahānād: It is in the district of Hooghly and it can be reached by Magra-Tarkeswar Light Railway. It was once the capital of Western Bengal. Mahānād contains the ruins of ancient palaces, old Hindu temples and old tanks. According to tradition it was the seat of king Candraketu, the ruins of whose *gaḍ* (moat) are still found there. The temple of Dvāravāsini, old ponds, e. g., Jiyatkunda, Pāpaharapakunda, and Sāt Satiner Dighi are found here. Near the old Śaiva temple of Jateśvaranātha we find some tombs. The Jāmāl-Jāngal Road, the Vāsisthagangā, and the Jiyatkunda are noteworthy.

Pāṇḍuā It is situated at a distance of 38 miles from Calcutta. It is commonly known as Pado. It is in the Hooghly District and is quite distinct from Pānduā of the Malda District. In the 15th century A. D. Samsuddin Isuf Shah, king of Gauda, conquered this Hindu kingdom of Pānduā. It contained many Hindu temples. An ancient Hindu temple dedicated to Sun-God was converted into a mosque. Besides this place contains damaged mosques and a minar which is 127 ft high. There are two tanks here by the name of Jodāpukur and Pīrpukur. Every year in the months of January and April fairs are held and many people bathe in the Pīrpukur, the water of which is considered to be sacred.

Katwa (Kātadvīpa): It is in the district of Burdwan, and a sacred place of the Vaisnavas because here Caitanyadeva at the age of twenty-four became a hermit and shaved his hair.

Jhāmāṭpura: Four miles to the north of Katwa there is a village called Jhāmāṭpura. It was the dwelling place of Kṛṣṇa-

¹ *Vāṁśike Hāṁsahar* *dakṣiṇe Trivenī* |
yātrider kolāhale *kichus nā suni* ||

dāsa Kaviṛāj, the celebrated author of the *Śrī-Caitanya Caritāmṛta*.¹

Kātnū :— It is in the district of Burdwan and is considered to be a very sacred place to the Hindus because it was the abode of the famous Vaisnava saints, Sūryadāsa, Gauridāsa, Jagannāthadāsa and Bhagavāndāsa. It is also famous as Ambikā-Kālnā.

Murshidabad :— It is situated at a distance of 122 miles from Calcutta, on the bank of the River Bhāgirathi. It was known to the ancients as Mukshudābād or Mukshusābād. It was the capital of the last independent ruler of Bengal. This city was well-built by Nawab Murshidkulī Khan who was then the viceroy (subedar) of Bengal. At one time this city was adorned with many magnificent buildings and palaces. It was an extensive city, populous and prosperous. The following are the noteworthy things there :

(1) *Imāmbūrū*, which was built by Nawab-Nazim Mansur Ali, it is 680 ft. long ;

(2) *Moti Jhal*, which contains a beautiful garden, it is now in ruins :

(3) *Hājārdūyārī*, which was the old palace of the Nawab, a massive structure ;

(4) *Katra Musjid*.

(5) *Tomb of Nawab Sharfaraz Khan* who became the Nawab of Murshidābād for one year after the death of Suja Khan ;

(6) *Tripolia Gate*.

(7) *Jahankosha Cannon*

(8) *Tōphkhanū*, which was built by Murshidkulī Khan, close to the *Katra Musjid* ; and

(9) *Nizamat-Adalat* and *Sadar Dewani Adalat* ; no trace of them is now found, on the ruins of these a beautiful palace with a delightful garden has been built.

On the other side of the Ganges flowing through the town of Berhampore stands the tomb of Nawab Shiraz-ud-daula.

Rāngāmāṭī : It is situated in the District of Murshidabad as distinct from Rāngāmāṭī of the Chittagong Hill tracts. The

¹ It is a famous book of the Vaisnavas of India. It is a monument of Hindu genius as a work on philosophy and literature. Much has been written in this book on Vaisnava philosophy.

site of Rāṅgāmāṭī in Murshidābād lies on the western coast of the Ganges, a mile and a half to the south-east of Chirati, a Railway Station, 94 miles from Bandel. The soil of this place is red and hard and offers clue to the name of this place. According to some the name is derived from *Raktamṛti* or *Raktabhūti* (*lo-to-wai-chi*) the name of an old Buddhist monastery which the Chinese traveller, Hiuen Tsang, found in Karnasuvarna in the 7th century A. D. Rāṅgāmāṭī is thus believed to have been the site of Karnasuvarna. Many coins of the Kusāpa and Gupta ages, a few mounds of bricks and clay called *Thākurvādī Dāṅgā*, *Rāksusī Dāṅgā*, *Rājvādī Dāṅgā*, *Samnyāsī Dāṅgā* and a few tanks like *Yamunā Puskarapī*, *Pir Pukur*, etc. are found there. A Hindu deity made up of stone with eight hands called *Mahisamardini*¹ has been discovered here.

Pāhādpura : The ruins of Pāhādpur are situated at a distance of three miles to the west of the Jāmālganj Railway Station (B. & A. Ry.) in the District of Rajshahi. The huge mound of bricks, 80 ft. in height, that stands at Pāhādpur probably gave rise to the name of this place as it looked like a rock. Somapura was its ancient name. Situated at a distance of about 30 miles to the northwest of Mahāsthāna or ancient Pundravardhana and southeast of Bāṅgad or ancient Kotivarsa, there stood an old Buddhist monastery now in ruins. The Pāhādpur monastery resembles such great monasteries as Barabudar² and Prāmbānam monasteries in Java and Angkorvat monastery³ in Cambodia. In the Buddhist vihāra at Pāhādpura we find a square sanctuary with many chambers, each having a courtyard in front and a small portico. A high altar is found probably meant for religious worship.

To the east of this sanctuary we find a little *stūpa* (shrine containing a relic, dagoba) called *Satyapīreṇ bhītā* where we find a temple of Tārā.⁴ The Pāhādpura monastery was built in the 8th century A. D. under the Pāla kings of Bengal. The terracotta

¹ Durgā, the killer of the demon Mahiṣa.

² Vide *The Life of the Buddha on the Stūpa of Barabudur* by Dr. Krom.

³ Vide *Indian Architecture (Buddhist and Hindu)* by Percy Brown.

⁴ Personification of Prajñāpāramitā or perfection of wisdom and consort of Avalokiteśvara, a Mahāyāna Bodhisattva.

plaques on the walls of the monastery contain the tales of the *Pañcatantra*¹ and the *Hutopadeśa*. The stone images of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, some lovely figures telling the stories of the life of Kṛṣṇa, slaying of Dhenukāsura, holding of Mt. Govardhana by Śrīkṛṣṇa are found here. The Epic and Pauranic scenes like the fight of Bālī and Sugrīva, the death of Bālī, the abduction of Subhadrā, etc., are also found. In the 5th century A. D. there was a Jain temple at Pāhādpura. The famous Tibetan Buddhist scholar, Dipankara Śrījñāna,² is said to have spent many years under his teacher, Ratnākara Śānti, in the Somapura mahāvihāra.

Khetuḍ: A village in the district of Rajshahi. It was visited by Caitanya in the 16th century A. D. A temple has been built here to commemorate his visit.

Mahāsthānagad: The present ruins of Mahāsthāna or Mahāsthānagad lie 7 miles north of the modern town of Bogra. Cunningham identifies this site with the ancient city of Pundravardhana, the name of which occurs in a Brahmanic inscription of the Maurya age. During the 4th, 5th and the 6th centuries A. D. when India was ruled by the Imperial Guptas, Pundravardhanabhukti was a Gupta province under a viceroy who had the title of *Uparika*. The river Karatoyā which still washes the base of the mounds of Mahāsthāna separated it from the more easterly kingdom of Prāgiyotisa or Kāmarūpa in Assam. Pundravardhana was visited by Hiuen Tsang in the 7th century A. D. According to the Chinese pilgrim this country was more than 4000 li in circuit and its capital more than 30 li³ (5 miles). To the west of the capital there was a magnificent Buddhist establishment and near it stood an Aśoka tope. The city lost its importance from the third quarter of the 12th century A. D. for the later Sena kings of Bengal shifted their capital first to Deopārā in the Rajshahi district and later to Gauda in the Maldah district. Towards the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century A. D. Pundravardhana was occupied by the Mahommedans.

¹ A collection of moral tales written in Sanskrit from which the *Hutopadeśa* is partly taken.

² Went to Tibet. He belonged to East Bengal. Author of *Caryāgītī* and *Dipankara Śrījñāna-gītīkā*, etc.

³ li—a Chinese mile, equal to more than $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of an English mile.

There was a village called Vāsu Bihāra, 4 miles to the west of Mahāsthān, which, according to Cunningham, was the site of the well-known monastery called *Po-shu-po*, by the Chinese pilgrim.

The following are the important things found at Mahāsthāna : a battered Jain statue, ruins of Hindu and Buddhist shrines ; and later tombs and mosques.

Bāngad : The ruins of Bāngad or Bānnagara are found on the eastern bank of the river Punarbhavā, one and a half mile to the north of Gangārāmpur which is 18 miles south of Dinajpur. The region round modern Gangārāmpur was called Damdamā during the muslim period and it may be identical with Koṭikapura or ancient Devkot, the capital of Kotivarsa in northern Bengal. Bāngad, according to tradition, was the site of the fortified town of the demon king, Bāna, whose wife Kālārānī is said to have a tank dug called Kaladighi at Gangārāmpura. Besides there are other tanks such as Tāldighi and Dhalādighi. Of the ancient buildings and monuments we have no trace at present. A Kamboja king of Gauda built a temple of Siva. According to the copper plate inscription of king Mahipāla I discovered at Bāngad, Mahipāla regained his lost paternal kingdom. Some of the old relics of Bāngad are now kept in the Dinajpur palace. Here we find a richly carved stone pillar made of touch-stone, a Siva temple and a Buddhist caitya (shrine or temple) of about the 11th century A. D.

Tarpanghāt : An important village in the district of Dinajpur. Here Vālmiki, the celebrated author of the *Rāmāyana* practised penances. Near by there is a brick built *stūpa* known as Sitākot which is said to have been the abode of Sitā, the banished wife of Rāmacandra.

Gauḍa : Gauda was the capital of Bengal during the Hindu and Muslim periods. According to some the name is derived from *guḍa*, i. e., molasses as Gauda was formerly a trading centre of molasses. The ruins of Gauda lie at a distance of ten miles to the south west of the modern town of Malda. It was an ancient town as its name occurs in the Epics and the Purāṇas. It was the capital of Devapāla, Mahendrapāla, Ādisura, Ballālasena and the Mahomedan rulers up to about the end of the

16th century A. D. It formed a part of the kingdom of the Imperial Guptas during the 4th, 5th and 6th centuries A. D. There is no trace at present of Ramāvati, the capital of ancient Gauda under Pāla rulers. It lay several miles to the north of the present site of the ruins of Gauda near the river Kālindī. Laksmanāvati or Laknauti which was built by king Lakshmanasena was the later capital of Gauda under Sena and Muslim rulers. King Ballālasena built a castle at Gauda which goes by the name of Ballālabādi or Ballālabhita. The ruins of this fort are found at Shahdullapur. One of the biggest tanks in Bengal known as Sāgardighi is attributed to him. Near the present site of Gauda stands the ancient village of Rāmakeli which was visited by Caitanyadeva. The abodes of Rūpa and Sanātana,¹ the Rūpasāgara tank, the Kadamba tree, some wells known as Rādhākunda, Śyāmākunda, Lalitākunda and Viśākhākunda and the ancient temple of Madanamohana are now found there. There is another village called Khalimpur near the site of Gauda. A copper plate inscription of king Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal has been discovered here. The following relics of the Muslim age are noteworthy —

1 *Jān Jān meah mosque* built by Sultan Gīyasuddin Mahmud Shah.

2 *The Dākhil Durwāzā* or the gate of the ancient muslim fort of Gauda.

3 *The well-known Sonā mosque (Burduāri)* — a square building built of stone

4 *Ruins of Hūvelī Khūs (or the ancient capital)*

5 *Tomb of Sultan Husain Shah* built of coloured bricks.

6 *Feroze minar* (high and massive structure).

7 *Kadam Rasul mosque* built by Sultan Nasiruddin Nasrat Shah in the 16th century A. D. containing 4 minarets of black stone and footprints of the Prophet

8 *Chūkā mosque*

9 *The famous Loton mosque* built of various coloured bricks (white, green, blue and yellow).

¹ They were the disciples of Caitanya who were sent by him to preach the cult of loving faith to Brindaban to discover the holy places where Śrī Kṛṣṇa engaged himself in līlā or sports.

Besides these there are other noteworthy objects, e. g., the temples of Gaudeśvari, Jaharāvasini, Śiva—the manaskāmanā deity,¹ Ramābhītā and Pātālacandī.

Pāṇḍuyā: The ruins of Pāṇḍuyā lie to the east of the river Mahānandā in the district of Malda. A clear trace of Hindu relics is found at Pāṇḍuyā in a dilapidated culvert with images of Hindu deities beneath it. Many remains of the Muslim age are found at this site, e. g., *Selām-Dargā*, *Āsānsāhi Dargā*, *Bask-Hāzārī Dargā*, *Ekdakkhi* and *Sonū mosques*, and the *Ādinā mosque* which is the most famous.

Vikramapura: It lies in the Munshiganj sub-division of Dacca. A portion of it is included in the Faridpur District. The name Vikramapura is generally applied to the tract of country bounded by the Dhaleśvari on the north, the Idilpur parganā on the south, the Meghnā on the east and the Padmā on the west. The name of this place is derived from a king named Vikrama who ruled it for sometime. Rāmapāla, the ancient capital of Vikramapura, lay 3 miles west of Munshiganj. The name Śrī Vikramapura occurs in the Sitāhātī Copper Plate Inscription of Ballālasena. A copper plate inscription of the Buddhist king Śrī Candradeva of the Candra dynasty has been discovered here. Rāmapāla, the birth place of Śīlabhadra, the principal of the famous Buddhist University of Nālandā, was the eastern headquarters of the Hindu kings of Bengal for sometime. The ruins of a palace called Ballālabādī, many ancient ponds called Rāmapālādighī, Ballāladighī, etc. and many Hindu and Buddhist deities of the Pāla period have been found at Vikramapura. To the north of Rāmapāla in a village a mosque of Ādam Śāhid is found. The village of Vajrayoginī lying on the south west corner of Rāmapāla was the birth place of the Buddhist savant, Dipankara Śrījñāna, who was born in the 10th century A. D.

Maināmātī and Lālmāi ranges Maināmātī is about 6 miles west of the present town of Comilla. The Lālmāi and Maināmātī rocks are situated in the district of Tippera in East Bengal. The name Maināmātī is probably associated with Mayanāmātī, the queen of Mānik Candra, a king of the Candra who ruled Bengal

¹ The deity who fulfils human desires.

in the 10th and 11th centuries A. D. This queen and her son Gopicandra figure largely in Bengali folk-songs. Queen Mayanāmāṭī seems to have been a disciple of Goraknātha, a great Śaiva yogī while her son was a disciple of a low caste *siddha* (perfected one). A copper plate inscription of the 13th century A. D. found at Maināmāṭī records gift of a piece of land by the king Ranavankamalla Harikāladeva to a Buddhist monastery at Pattikera. An officer of the royal groom is mentioned as embracing Sahajayāna Buddhism¹ at Pattikeraka. A village of the Tippera district which extends up to the Maināmāṭī hills even now retains the name Pāṭikārā or Paitkārā. The existence of the kingdom of Pattikera may be traced as far back as the 8th century A. D. It was situated in ancient Samatata. Coins similar to those of the Candra dynasty and terracotta plaques, with figures of Arakanese and Burmese men and women, have been found at Maināmāṭī. In these coins the name of Pāṭikera occurs. It appears that there was an intimate relation between Burma and the kingdom of Pattikera. Ranavankamalla Harikāladeva was a chieftain of this place while the Devas were then the independent rulers. The Pattikeraka viḥāra of the Pāla period was an important monastery. A mound at Maināmāṭī known as the ruins of Ānanda Rājā's palace seems to be a monastery. Some rulers of the Candra dynasty, e g, Sri Candra, Gobinda Candra, Suvarna Candra, Purna Candra, etc, mentioned in the inscriptions ruled eastern and southern Bengal between A. D. 900 and 1050 with Rohitāgiri as their capital. Rohitāgiri probably included the present Lālmāi hills, 5 miles to the west of Comilla.

The naked-stone image of a Jaina *Tīrthankara* (head of a sect) found at Maināmāṭī, shows the influence of Jainism in this region. The discovery of such deities as Gaṇeśa, Hara-Gaurī,

¹ The Sahajayāna better Sahajasiddhi was the latest phase of Buddhism in eastern India. It arose as a protest against unnecessary rituals, excessive academic zeal, the *tantras*, *mantras*, *yantras*, *mandalas* and other paraphernalia of the two earlier forms of Mahāyāna, namely the *Bodhisattva naya* (the classical) and the *Agrānaya* (the advanced). It advocated Sahajasiddhi as the quickest and the surest way of awakening in us the *Bodhicitta* which is the means of attaining *Bodhi* or enlightenment. Bengali songs of the Sahajiyā School, *Bauddha Gān o Dōhā* by H. P. Shāstri.

Vāsudeva, shows the influence of Hinduism there. Of some mounds situated at Maināmāti Anandarāja's palace, Bhojarāja's palace, Candimurā, Rūpabānmurā, Śālbhanrāja's palace are noteworthy. In one of these mounds we find temples of Śiva and Candī. A square monastery like that at Pāhādpura existed there. The central temple contains on its walls projecting mouldings, lotus petals, etc. Many carved terracotta plaques which contain the figures of *Yakkhas*,¹ *Kimpurusas*,² *Gandharvas*,³ *Vidyādharas*,⁴ *Kinnaras*, *Buddha*, *Padmaṣāpi*, warriors, animals, lotus flowers, etc. have been discovered. The potteries found there are mostly in ruins. Some small bronze images of the Buddha have also been found.

Candranātha. In the vicinity of Sitākunda there are the famous temples of Candranātha and Sambhunātha, in the district of Chittagong, which are much frequented by pilgrims from all parts of Bengal. The peak of Candranātha is regarded as a place beloved of Śiva. The shrine on the top of the hill contains a *lingam* or symbolical representation of Śiva and the ascent to it is said to redeem the pilgrim from the miseries of future births. The largest gathering takes place at the *Śiva Caturdaśī* festival.

Sundarban: The forest region of Sundarban was formerly included in the kingdom of Samatata or Bāgdi (Vyāghratatī). The Chinese pilgrim, Hsüen Tsang, saw many Hindu, Buddhist and Jain temples at Samatata in the 7th century A. D. but no trace of them has yet been found. Some decorated bricks, fragments of stone sculptures, coins of Skandagupta and Huviska, an image of Śūrya and a Navagraha slab, etc., have been discovered here.

¹ They are supernatural beings, deities of varying ranks. They are benevolent and are closely connected with vegetation, human fertility and wealth. They are essentially tree-spirits and they possess magic power. The cult of Yakkhas may be described as an early form of devotional Hinduism, perhaps going back to a period in history contemporary with the Vedas. The individual Yekkhās are for the most part local and tutelary deities.

² Wild men of the woods same as *Kinnaras*.

³ A class of Demigods, heavenly Musicians.

⁴ Demigods who are magicians.

AN UNNOTICED ASPECT OF GAUDAPĀDA'S MĀNDŪKYA KĀRIKĀS

BY
P. T. Raju

There have already been many articles on Gaudapāda and his *Kārikās*; but all of them have been occupied either with proving that he was a Buddhist, or that he was a vedantin who was greatly influenced by Buddhist ideas, which he incorporated into the Vedānta, or that neither was he a Buddhist nor was he influenced by Buddhist ideas. Pandit Vidhusekhar Sastri practically maintained the extreme position that Gaudapāda wrote the last chapter of his *Kārikās* to develop the Upanisadic theory into the Buddhist *Vijñānavāda*, thereby showing the superiority of the latter to the former.¹ Of course, it may easily be shown that Gaudapāda was not a Buddhist, that the *Kārikās*, or even the fourth chapter was not meant to show the superiority of the *Vijñānavāda* to the Vedānta. Even the fourth chapter praises *Vipras*² or Brahmins and speaks of *brahmanyam padam*³. It is true that Buddha very often spoke of the Brahmins with respect and that Asanga, the author of *Mahāyānasūtrā-lankāra*, spoke of the realisation of the Brahman as the highest achievement. But this only proves the influence of the Vedānta on Buddhism, that some of the Upanisadic ideas were securing a place in Buddhist thought. If Gaudapāda had really been a Buddhist and wanted to show that the *Vijñānavāda* was truer than the Vedānta, he would not have used Vedantic terms. Besides, the word *Aja*, which Gaudapāda so glorifies, is, though it means *anulpanna*, particularly a Vedantic term. Just as it is said that Śamkara explains away the term *buddha*, it may be said that the Buddhist interpretation of the *Kārikās* will have to explain away *Aja*. Further, it is not reasonable to take the

¹ *Proceedings of the Oriental Conference, 1922*

² Stanza 86. ³ Stanza 85.

fourth chapter apart from the other three chapters. And if Gaudapāda defends the Vedānta in the latter, he must be doing the same in the former. And there is no evidence to show that he changed his mind later after writing the first three chapters or that he meant the first three chapters to be only stepping stones for proving the final validity of the *Vijñānavāda*.

But we cannot so easily controvert the opinion that Gaudapāda was greatly influenced by the *Vijñānavāda*. It may be shown that the word *vijñāna*, even in the sense of the highest reality, is common to both the Upanisads¹ and Buddhism, though, in the former, *vijñāna* is more often used with reference to *vijñānamayaśarīra* and *buddhi*. But there are many other words which are distinctly technical (*pārisbhāṣika*) terms of Buddhist philosophy. *Dharma* in the sense of a phenomenal thing,² *bhūva* in the sense of a perishable thing,³ *dhātu* in the sense of *vastu*,⁴ *buddha* in the sense of awakened, cannot easily be explained away as non-Buddhist also. Particularly the words *buddha* and *dharma* in the peculiarly Buddhist sense occur too often. There are other words also like *saṃvṛti satya*,⁵ *saṃghāta*,⁶ *alātaśānti*, which is the heading of the fourth chapter, *asparśayoga*,⁷ and *lakṣanāśūnyam*,⁸ which are common to the Advaita also. And it may be admitted that the sentence, *nantadbuddhena bhūṣṭam*,⁹ can be interpreted both according to the Advaita and the *Vijñānavāda*. But on the whole, the influence of the *Vijñānavāda* is very obvious. Also, it is likely that Gaudapāda was converted to Buddhism first or might have been a born Buddhist before he accepted Vedantism and gave it his own interpretation. There is also another possibility, which we shall have to accept in the absence of any definite evidence in favour of other possibilities, namely, there must have been a ferment of ideas both in the Buddhist and Vedantic folds, due to mutual criticism and discussion, and what appeared to be the

¹ *Māṇḍūkya Kārikās*, IV, 45, 48, 50, etc., *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* III, 9, 28 *vijñānamānandam brahma*. Also op. III, 4, 2 *vijñāntervijñātāram* but not merely *vijñāntervijñātāram*.

² IV, 6, 8, 10, 21, 46, 53, etc., etc. ³ II, 1, 13, 16, 19. ⁴ IV, 81.

⁵ II, 1, 4; IV, 33, 57, 73, 74. ⁶ III, 3, 10. ⁷ III, 39; IV, 2.

⁸ IV, 67. ⁹ IV, 99.

most cogent ideas might have been incorporated, with slight differences, by both schools. But in the development of metaphysical systems, so far as available literature goes, Buddhism seems to have taken the lead. The *Prajñāpāramitās*, out of which both the Madhyamika and the Vijñānavāda schools sprung up, are earlier than Nāgārjuna (2nd century A. D.) But the *Prajñāpāramitās* themselves must have developed out of ideas borrowed from the Upanisads. The Buddhists must have entered into controversies with the Vedantins during and before the time of the *Prajñāpāramitās*, after which the former must have brought together the results of the controversies in a somewhat systematic form. And as shown by Bādarāyana's references to earlier Vedantins, the Upanisadic ideas also must have been grouped together in some systematic form by Kaśakṛtsna and others. But these are lost for us, and were lost probably even for Gaudapāda, who makes no reference to them. The *Brahmasūtras* themselves required interpretation and systematisation. And Gaudapāda, therefore, must have approached the Upanisads themselves from the side of the *Vijñānavāda*, which might have appeared as the best metaphysical system of the time, nearest to the Upanisadic teachings. The *Māṇḍūkya* contains the central teaching of the Upanisads and constitute the inner approach to the philosophical problem for all orthodox systems. Gaudapāda therefore must have attempted to interpret the *Māṇḍūkya* itself from the side of the *Vijñānavāda*, which was incorporated into the Vedānta.

II

What has so far been discussed has been noticed by a number of scholars, and the discussion is briefly given here only so far as it concerns the purpose of the present paper. Now, there is another aspect of the *Kūrūkās*, which seems to have escaped notice so far. The ferment of philosophic ideas of the age must have contained not only the Upanisadic and Buddhist ideas but also the Śaivite. It is difficult to say that the Śaivite ideas are not Upanisadic; but they have a peculiar quality or colour of their own. They have their own terminology. That the world is the *spanda* of Śiva or Śiva's Śakti is a theory peculiar to Śaivism.

Gaudapāda uses the word *spanda* in as many as six stanzas.¹ At one place he speaks of the world as the *spanda* of *manas*,² at another as the *spanda* of *citta*,³ and in three places as *vijñāna-spanda*,⁴ and compares all these to *alāta-spanda*.⁵ *Manas* and *citta* may be taken to mean the same for the *Kārikās*. Then the world has to be understood as the *spanda* of *vijñāna* or *citta*, so far as the teaching of the *Kārikās* is concerned. Gaudapāda uses the word *Māyā* more than once.⁶ but he does not speak of the *spanda* of *Māyā*. And for him, *Māyā* is not existent.⁷ Anyway, he must have meant that *citta-spanda* and *vijñāna-spanda* are the same, though not directly at least indirectly. He asserts also that the *spanda* and its effects cannot enter *vijñāna*, which is *acala*.⁸ We may indeed raise the question how *vijñāna*, which is *acala*, can have any *spanda* to which we cannot find a direct answer, or the only answer possible, consistent with the *vyṭīkṣā*, is that even the *spanda* of *vijñāna* is *Māyā*, which is not *sat* (*na vidyate*). Vidyāranya probably would have said that this *spanda* is the *śakti* of *vijñāna*, and that *spanda* has no existence means that it is not a separate entity from *vijñāna*.⁹ It is not necessary now to go farther into this ultimate logical question; we are interested only in showing that Gaudapāda uses the word *spanda* in a very significant sense. Just as we see straight lines, curved lines, circles etc., so long as there is *alāta-spanda*, we see the world so long as there is *vijñāna-spanda*. And just as, when the *spanda* of the *alāta* ceases, these figures do not enter the *alāta*; when the *spanda* of *vijñāna* ceases, the world of forms due to that *spanda* does not enter *vijñāna*. That is, *vijñāna* as such is pure. It is *vijñānamūtra*.¹⁰

III

Such a significant usage of the concept of *spanda* makes us think that Gaudapāda was influenced not only by the ideas of the *Vijñānavāda* but also by the *spanda* doctrine. The question may now be raised whether this *spanda* doctrine was incorporated

¹ III, 29, IV, 47, 48, 49, 51, 72. ² III, 29 ³ IV, 72.

⁴ IV, 47, 48, 51 ⁵ IV, 49 ⁶ II, 19, IV, 58 ⁷ IV, 58.

⁸ IV, 51, 52. ⁹ See *Pañcadaśī*, II, 47

¹⁰ Cf. Saṃkara's Commentary on *Kārikā*, IV, 52. *Vijñānamūtre jātyadi-buddhirmrṣaiva*.

from Śaivism or from some other independent system, for it is not to be found in the principal Upanisads. Even the *Śvetāśvatara*, which is Śaivite, does not speak of *spanda*, though it speaks of *Māyā*. And we have no evidence to prove the existence of a non-Śaivite *spanda* system. If we therefore take it as belonging to Śaivism, we may further ask whether it is the same as the Kasmir *spanda* system expounded by Vasugupta and his followers. We know that Gaudapāda is earlier than Vasugupta, who belonged to about the first half of the 9th century A. D. Even Śaṅkara, the grand disciple of Gaudapāda, belonged to the 8th century A. D. Gaudapāda therefore cannot be much later than the 7th. Sir S. Radhakrishnan, in his *Indian Philosophy*, writes: "He must be much earlier, since Walleser states that the *Kārikā* is quoted in the Tibetan translation of Bhavaviveka's *Turkajvālā*. The latter author is earlier than Yuan Chwang, and Gaudapāda must be therefore about A. D. 550."¹ If this is true, then Gaudapāda must have lived about one and half centuries after Asaṅga, the famous *vijñānavādin* and the author of *Mahāvāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*. In any case, he is undoubtedly earlier than Vasugupta, the first well-known exponent of the *spanda* doctrine.

We have therefore to think that the *spanda* doctrine must have been current, in some form or other, during the time of Gaudapāda. And this *spanda* doctrine has very close resemblance to that expounded by Vasugupta. The ultimate *tattva* for Gaudapāda is *vijñāna*, and for Vasugupta, is Śiva whose nature is *jñāna*. Even the original Upanisad speaks of the fourth state as Śiva, which of course need not be identified with the Śiva of Śaivism, and Gaudapāda also speaks of the *ātman* as Śiva,² *Prabhu*, *Īśāna*, *Īvara* and so forth. Just as the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikās* are based on the interpretation of the three states of wakefulness, dream and deep sleep, the *Spandakārikās* are based on their interpretation,³ the only difference being that the former maintain that the fourth state (*turīyāvasthā*) is identical with Śiva, while the latter contend that there is a fourth state beyond the three, which is still *mohātṃskā*,⁴ and that only in the fifth state can we be identical

¹ Vol II, p. 452 footnote ² I, 29. ³ I, 2, 14, II, 1, 2 etc.

⁴ See the *Prerts* of Rāmakaṣṭha, II, 9.

with Śiva. Both are thus based on the explanation of the three states. Even the *Māṇḍūkyakārikās* speak of *bijamdrā* or sleep which is the matrix of the world.¹ It is well known that, according to Śaivism, *Māyāśakti*, out of which the world issues forth, is the *Nidrā* of Śiva. The *Spandakārikās* speak of Śiva as *anūvṛta*,² which is the same as *asumṛta*. The *Māṇḍūkyakārikās* also speak of *samvṛti*.³ The idea of *samvṛtisatya* is innately connected with these ideas. One feels that the *āvaranāśakti* is the same as this *samvarama* or *samvṛti* and the *vikāśpāśakti* the same as *spanḍa*. Or these ideas might have some common root ideas. Very likely, there were some common ideas belonging to the philosophical atmosphere of the time, and they gradually developed and took some definite shapes in the different systems. However, Gaudapāda speaks of *icchāmūlram prabhossrṣṭi*⁴ as not a very tenable view, and is perhaps refuting the theory that the world is due to the *icchāśakti* of Śiva. And we can understand him, because he is interested in proving that *Māyā* is not *sat*, whereas those that maintain that the world is a *parināma* of Śiva's *Sakti*, hold that it is *sat*. But we cannot clinch this point, because Abhinavagupta, who belongs to the same Kasmir school of Śaivism, writes

Samsāroste na tattvatustanubhṛtūm bandhusya vārtava kā
bandho yasya na jātu tasya vātathā muktasya muktikṛyā
mūṭhyāmohakṛdeṣa rajjubhujagacchāyāpātācābhṛam
*ma kṛmityaja mā grhāna vāsa smastho yutkāxshitak*⁵

and practically supports Gaudapāda every way. For this stanza involves *ajātivrūda*, the view that the world is not existent, and that it is *bhṛama* (*māyā*). The *Spandakārikās* describe the fourth stage as a great *ākāśa* (*mahāvyaoma*), which though devoid of the duality of subject and object, is yet *mohālmikā* and *āvṛtā*, because of the absence of *īśvaraśaktipāta*.⁶ But as there is no such fourth state in the *Māṇḍūkya*, the highest itself is compared to pure *ākāśa*. Such comparison is very common in both the Upanisads and Buddhist works, and is not peculiar to any. But an important point to note in this connection is that the fourth state of

¹ I, 13 ² I, 2. ³ II, 1, 4, IV, 33, 57, 73, 74. ⁴ I, 8.

⁵ *Anuttarāṅgikā*, ⁶ See Ramakanta's Comm. on II, 9.

the *Spandakārikās* is generally equated by the Kāśmīr Śaivites to the *śūnya* of the Mādhyamikas, whose highest truth is thereby shown to be lower than that of the *spanda* system.¹ This shows that Kāśmīr Śaivism tried, in a way slightly different from that of Gaudapāda, to incorporate some of the important ideas of Buddhism. Or perhaps while Gaudapāda tried to absorb *vijñānavāda*, the *spanda* system of Kāśmīr tried to absorb both *vijñānavāda* and *śūnyavāda*.

The point of our present interest is that Gaudapāda incorporated the *spanda* doctrine into his philosophy, and this *spanda* doctrine significantly resembles the *spanda* doctrine of Kāśmīr, which was much later. It is believed by some that the Kāśmīr Śaivādvaitsa sprung up after Śaṅkara's visit to Kāśmīr in the 8th century.² But the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikās* show that the *spanda* ideas must have been current in India at least a century before Śaṅkara. Hence it cannot be true that the *spanda* ideas took shape only after Śaṅkara. But the earlier Śaiva teachers of Kāśmīr, influenced by the Advaita of Śaṅkara might have imported *spanda* ideas from outside. But the greatest possibility is that they entered Kāśmīr, if they entered from outside at all, along with Śaṅkara, who must have inherited the teachings of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikās* from his *paramaguru*, Gaudapāda. If such is the truth, then the *spanda* system, though it developed in Kāśmīr, might have originated outside Kāśmīr. And the ideas must have been current in the country to which Gaudapāda belonged.

It is said that the family cult of Śaṅkara was Saktism and that he was worshipping Śiva.³ So both Śaivism and Saktism must be existing throughout India by that time and also by the time of Gaudapāda. We read that Lakuli, the founder of Paśupata, belonged to the 1st century A. D., and that all the sects of Śaivism originated from his teachings. And Gaudapāda's teaching shows that the *spanda* doctrine must have been existent in

¹ Abhinavagupta's *Pratyabhijñānāsāraṇī*, Vol. II, p. 234. Interestingly enough, K. M. Sen points out that *śūnya* stands for the highest truth in a number of Śaiva and Sakta tantras. See his "Conception and Development of the Śūnya Doctrine in Medieval India", *Proceedings of the Oriental Conference, 1938*.

² K. C. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta*, p. 91.

³ Sir S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 418.

the 7th century, if not in the 6th or even earlier. The period from the 1st century A. D. right up to about the 7th must have been an age of intense philosophical activity in India, when there must have been a great ferment of ideas and attempts at system making. The *Prajñapāramitās*, which are earlier than Nāgārjuna, must be assigned at least the 1st century A. D. The *Sūtras* of Vyāsa, Kanāda and Gautama must have belonged to about the 2nd and the 3rd centuries.¹ From about the 2nd onward, Mahāyāna systems were developing, though the Mahāyāna itself might have been formed earlier. The Mahāyāna systems must have been giving a great impetus to the development of metaphysical systems in the orthodox fold. Through mutual criticism and borrowing, the current schools were developing their systems, and making them more and more adequate to a common fund of innate spiritual experiences. Śaivism also must have developed its *spanda* doctrines to an appreciable extent even by the time of Gaudapāda. The fact that Gaudapāda, though later than Bādarāyaṇa, makes no reference to his *Sūtras*, indicates that he thought out his system independently and constructed it with elements from the Upanisads, the *Vijñānavāda* and the *spanda* doctrine. And perceiving that the origin of most of these ideas could be traced to the Upanisads and the rest developed out of them, he professed to be a *smūrta*. But later, his disciples and their disciples might have noticed the kinship of his ideas to earlier *advaita* and brought his ideas into relationship with the *Brahmasūtras*. That Gaudapāda developed his theories independently of the *Brahmasūtras* and in consonance with the Upanisads may be one of the reasons why Śaṅkara's *Blāsya* on the *Sūtras* appears to be more in agreement with the Upanisads than with the *Sūtras*. Gaudapāda himself must have known these famous *Sūtras*, but somehow he ignored them.

¹ There are some who say that all these are much earlier. In any case, the period must have been one of mutual influence and ferment of ideas, particularly due to the growth of Buddhism, which was heterodox and yet was developing good logic and metaphysics.

The conclusion of this discussion is obvious: Gaudapāda was a *smūrta* Vedantin and not a Buddhist. He utilised not only the ideas of the *Vijñānavāda* but also of *spanda*, which must have been current by his time. The *spanda* doctrine could not have originated in Kāśmīr as late as the 8th or the 9th century, but must be earlier and must have belonged at least to the country where Gaudapāda was living. (Or was Gaudapāda himself the originator of that doctrine?) The Buddhist metaphysics was overwhelmed not only by the Vedānta but also by Śaivism, both of which incorporated the Mahāyāna ideas. And each of the three was borrowing not only metaphysical ideas but also spiritual experiences from the other two. There might also have been a fund of spiritual experience common to all, which none was able to deny in controversies.

NOTES ON A FEW WORDS

BY

BIMALACHARAN DEB

I

The student of Sanskrit is set an interesting problem when he finds two or more words, which he had been told were synonymous, used in one single passage. It is only natural that he thinks they are not really synonymous as he had been told, and that there must be some distinction between them so as to justify their juxtaposition, and this starts him on an enquiry.

The enquiry thus started is often a baffling one. He finds that, either there is no commentary available, or, if there is one, it reminds him of the well-known gibe *दुर्बोधं यद्वर्तते* &c. Moreover, he finds that the farther a commentator (or lexicographer) is away in point of time from the book in relation to which information is sought, the more likely he is to be uncertain or mistaken as to the meanings of words, and sometimes the wrong explanation is due to obsession of class interests or to ignorance of the particular branch of knowledge regarding which he is giving information. I shall have occasion to illustrate these points by citing actual cases as I go on. The *koṣas*, and modern Dictionaries and commentaries (which, more often than not, rely very much on the *koṣas*), are, accordingly, sometimes disappointing and sometimes positively confusing.

Another difficulty which confronts the student is *लिपिक्रममाद*. And the position is rendered extremely difficult indeed when an inadvertent (or incompetent) editor perpetuates it in print, and the error, almost as a matter of course, finds its way into a Dictionary. I shall here give one of the instances which have come to my notice.

Mahābhārata 4, 4, 26 (C. P.) reads in the text *नाहमस्य प्रियोऽस्मीति सत्त्वा सेवेत पठितः*; and in the *Nilakantha tīkā* पठितः 'सिल्हके कवौ इति विश्व'; *Medinī* (Calcutta, 1869) also reads पठितः 'सिल्हके कवौ'.

That made me think (apart from its being incongruous in the context), even supposing पंडित may be synonymous with कवि, how does सिल्हक (which is a balsam or gum) come in ? Looking up पंडित in Apte, I find one of the meanings given there is " incense ". Monier Williams also gives the same meaning, " incense, L ".—" L " meaning " lexicographer ", i. e., giving as his authority some lexicographer, whom, however, he does not name, (a very unsatisfactory practice with M. W.), but it seems practically certain that he is referring to Viśva or Medinī or both. Thereafter I look up Śabdakalpādruma and find, s. v. सिल्हक, two of its synonyms कपि (and not कवि), and पिंडात (not पंडित). That explains it—पिंडात सिल्हके कपौ has become पंडित. सिल्हके कपौ. But this error has gone into Apte and Monier Williams. One would hesitate to object if Apte and Monier Williams are cited as authorities on the point.

So much on the negative side.

On the positive side, I have learnt from all this the deep truth of the sayings नैकपदानि निर्वात् (Nirukta 2. 3 4) and ग्रंथो हि ग्रंथांतरस्य टीका and of that śloka in Susruta Samhitā, 1 4 6 —

एकं शास्त्रमधीयानो न विद्याच्छास्त्रनिश्चयम् ।

तस्माद् बहुश्रुतः शास्त्रं विजानीयाच्चिकित्सकः ॥

That is to say, Remember the context always,—and, Cast your net wide if you are really anxious to know the correct meaning of a word.

With these words, I would set down what I have found about certain words —

I वसा, मेदस्.

We find वसा and मेदस् mentioned together in वसामेदोवहा कुल्या नामानां संप्रवर्तिता Mb 1 53 12 (CP)=1, 48, 12 (B. O. R. I.) वसामेदोवहा कुल्यास्तत्र पीत्वा च पायक । जगाम परमां तृप्तिं दर्शयामास चाऽर्जुनम् ॥ Mb 1, 231. 6 (CP)=1 225 6 (B. O. R. I.).

Bhīma's गदा is described as वसामेदोपदिग्धांगी Mb 9. 11. 52 (CP).

What is the distinction between वसा, and मेदस् ? Nilakantha does not say anything at any of these places.

Let us see, first, what lexicographers say :—

Amarakośa, 2 6 64 says *बुकाग्रमांसं हृदयं हृन्मेदस्तु वषा वसा*. This passage has been read in two different ways.— (1) *बुकाग्रमांसं हृदयं हृतं, मेदस्तु वषा वसा*. This is the reading of Mahēśvara in his *ṭīkā* to Amarakośa. (2) *बुकाग्रमांसं हृदयं, हृन्मेदस्तु वषा वसा*. This is the reading evidently adopted by Śabdakalpadrūma, because, in explaining *वषा*, it says *सा च हृदयस्थपातुः*. (see s. v. *वषा*) Gangādhara Kavirāja, a renowned *vaidyā* of Bengal, in his *ṭīkā* to Caraka Saṃhitā (published Samvat 1925–1937), called ‘Jalpakaḥpataru’, definitely adopts this reading *हृन्मेदस्तु वषा वसा*.

Leaving aside the first portion as not material for our present purpose, my view is that both the readings of the latter portion (*मेदस्तु वषा वसा* and *हृन्मेदस्तु वषा वसा*) are wrong. This is not surprising. Amara Simha, a Jain, cannot be expected to know much about *मेदस्* or *वषा* or *वसा*. [It may seem presumptuous on my part to say that Amarakośa is wrong here, but I shall go further and say that this is not the only place where I have found it to be wrong. I shall show at the proper time and place where it is wrong and why. As regards a famous commentator also, I think he is wrong on a certain point and for a similar reason. This also I shall state at the proper time and place.]

Apte says, s. v. *मेदस्*, n.—“1. Fat, marrow (one of the seven dhātus of the body and supposed to lie in the abdomen) M. S. 3. 182, Y. 1. 44; 2. Corpulence, fat of the body”

That Apte is wrong in saying “marrow” is beyond question; marrow is *मज्जा*. His “fat of the body” is much wider than the fat “supposed to lie in the abdomen”, and this latter is also vague.

Monier Williams gives as one of the meanings of *मेदस्* n., “Fat, marrow, lymph (as one of the 7 dhātus, q. v.; its proper seat is said to be the abdomen)”.

Monier Williams is similarly wrong in saying “marrow”; and “lymph” seems unjustified. He also limits it to the abdomen.

Now, let us see how the matter stands so far as *प्रयोग* is concerned, i. e., how the words in question are used in literature. It is good to remember the maxim *प्रयोगशरणा वैयाकरणः* :

Manu, 3. 182, mentions मेदस्, but unfortunately Medhātithi does not explain it nor does Kullūka. Bühler (S. B. E.), however, translates it as "adipose secretions"

Yājñavalkya Smṛti, 1. 44, mentions मेदस्, but Mitākṣarā does not explain it. Yāj Sm., 3, 94, mentions वषावसावहननश्च Here Mitākṣarā says वषा प्रसिद्धा वसा मांसस्नेहः . We keep aside वषा for the present. According to Mitākṣarā, then, वसा is the fat in the flesh, i. e., the adipose tissue

Devanna Bhatta, in his Smṛticandrikā (ed. Gharpure), Part III, p. 135, l. 18, quotes वसामेदांश्च वीषम् and explains—वसा पाकादिना विभक्तो मांसश्चेहः । मेदो हृदयकमलाच्छादकादिमांसविशेषः । पाकादिना विभक्तः । तदीयश्चेहोऽत्र मेदःशब्देन लक्ष्यते । Thus according to Smṛ. Ca., both वसा and मेदस् are found in the body, and both are procured by 'cooking'. There is, however, this distinction between the two,—the former is 'the fat in the flesh', i. e., adipose tissue (मांसस्नेहः), and the latter is 'the fat in the covering of the heart' (pericardium).

Devanna Bhatta's explanation of वसा seems to gain support from Sayana in his Commentary to Taitt. Sam 1. 3. 10. 1, where he says मांसपाकभांडे स्थितः स्नेहात्मको द्रवविशेषो वसा.

Now let us look to medical works, which ought to be more definite on the point in question than the class of books just referred to.

We find Caraka Samhitā, 4. 6. 12, saying तस्मान्मांसमाप्याद्यते मांसं...मेदो मेदसा, वसा वसया and further saying at 4. 7. 17, when describing the components of a body and their quantities, त्रयो वसायाः, द्वौ मेदसः, एको मज्जाः.

So, according to Ca. Sam., वसा and मेदस् are different from each other.

But, Ca. Sam., at 1. 25. 22-30, in discussing the nutritive properties of certain foods, says लोहितशालयः शूकधान्यानां पथ्यतमत्वे श्रेष्ठतमा भवन्ति...वराहवसा आनूपमृगवसानां, चुलुकीवसा मत्स्यवसानां, हंसवसा जलचरविहंगवसानाम् । कुक्कुटवसा विष्किरशकुनिवसानाम्, अजामेदः शाखादमेदसाम् । अहिततमानामुपदेक्ष्यामः.....महिषवसा आनूपमृगवसानाम्, कुंभीरवसा मत्स्यवसानाम्, काकमर्गुवसा जलचरविहंगवसानाम् । चटकवसा विष्किरशकुनिवसानाम्, हस्तिमेदः शाखादमेदसाम् ।

This latter passage seems to disturb the above statements in the same book (4, 6, 12, 4, 7, 17) which clearly treat वसा and मेदस् as two different things. Any way, we are not told by Ca Sam, exactly what वसा and मेदस् are or is.

Ca Sam is a 'Physician's Handbook'. Let us see Susruta Samhitā, which is a "Surgeon's Handbook" and ought to tell more about it.

Susruta Samhitā, 3, 4, 11-13, says मेदो हि सर्वभूतानाम् उदरस्थम् अण्वस्थिषु च महत्सु मज्जा भवति । भवति चाऽत्र-स्थूलमास्थिषु विशेषेण मज्जा त्वभ्यन्तराश्रिताः । अथेतरेषु सर्वेषु सरक्तं मेद उच्यते । शुद्धमांसस्य यः क्लृप्तः सा वसा परिकीर्तिता ॥

So,—मज्जा (marrow) is the " fat " in the big bones.

मेदस् is the " fat " in the abdomen (i e., inside the abdominal cavity, meaning the omentum and the abdominal viscera in general) and in the smaller bones.

वसा is the " fat " in the flesh, i. e., adipose tissue (excluding, of course, the abdominal viscera).

Accordingly,—मेदस् and वसा are both " fat ", but of different kinds altogether.

In these circumstances, Amarakośa must be wrong in so far as it makes वसा synonymous with मेदस्. Similarly, Smr Ca must be wrong in so far as it says that मेदस् is the fat in the pericardium. The reading of Amarakośa adopted by Śabdakalpadrūma and by Gaṅgādhara (हृन्मेदस्तु वषा वसा) must also be wrong.

II. वषा.

As regards the lexicographers, we have already referred to Amarakośa, 2, 6. 64, and shown that Amarakośa is wrong in making वसा synonymous with मेदस्. Its mistake is worse as regards वषा.

Medini says वषा विवरमेदसो., i e., वषा means ' a hollow or cavity ', and also मेदस्. So far as मेदस् is concerned, it is the same as (if not actually based on) Amarakośa and, is, like it, wholly wrong.

Coming next to Apte, we find him saying, s v वषा " 1. Fat, marrow. Y. 3. 94 ; 2. A hole, cavity, 4. The skin of the intestines ".

Apte seems wholly wrong. वषा is neither " fat " nor " marrow "

(which is मज्जा) nor " the skin of the intestines " His ' 2. A hole, cavity " is obviously based on Medinī

Monier Williams gives no less than five meanings of वपा, Nos 2 to 4 being " a cavity, a hollow, hole, the skin or membrane investing the intestines or parts of the viscera, the caul or omentum, V. S. &c., &c., (the horse has no omentum according to SBr), the mucous or glutinous secretion of the bones or flesh, marrow, fat (= medas) L "

Monier Williams also seems to be wholly wrong He does not, as usual, mention the name or names of his " L ", but it seems to be no other than Amarakoṣa and Medinī.

Coming to प्रयोग now, we find the word used in Yāj. Sm., as referred to by Apte But there Mātṛkāśā is disappointing. It satisfies itself by saying वपा प्रसिद्धा

Caraka Samhitā, 4. 7. 14, enumerates the कंठाग's, i. e., the internal organs contained in the hollow of the entire torso (and not merely the abdominal cavity), and there, in company with हृदय, यकृत and ग्रही is mentioned वपायदन This shows that it is different from हृदय, so that the idea that हृन्मद is वपा must be wrong The reason for the suffix, वहन, I have not been able to find But, from what I have found, as I shall presently show, it seems to mean " sustaining or supporting the वपा ".

In Kauśika Sūtra, 3. 7, we find ऋषभदहिनो वपयेंद्र यजेत. Sāyana to A V 7. 40. 1 says वृषभवपया इन्द्रं यजेत But we do not get here what exactly वपा is.

The first indication of what it is like I got from Introduction to Sāyana to A V 18. 2. 51—अग्नेर्वैम [५८] इत्यनया सप्तच्छिद्रया गो- [वपया] प्रेतमुखम् आच्छादयेत् This refers to the अनुस्तरणी गौः and shows that this वपा was a part of its body and must have been very much like a sheet in appearance, and in which seven holes were made, (obviously, one for each of the सप्त इन्द्रियाः प्राणाः) That this sheet-like thing was large enough to cover the dead person's face is clear, so that it could not be such a small thing as the pericardium, nor such small, flimsy bits like the " skin of the intestines ", or " caul " or " omentum " (i. e., peritoneal membrane, which is not like a sheet). To suggest,

with the above passage before one's eyes, that it is " the mucous or glutinous secretion of the bones or flesh, marrow, fat ", would, on the face of it, be absurd.

Upto this, however, we get that it is something like a sheet, but nothing more.

In Taitt. Sam. 2 1. 1. 4, we get स (i. e. प्रजापति) आत्मनो वपामु द-
क्खिदत्. Sayana makes the thing perfectly clear here by saying
स्वशरीराद् मध्यवर्तिनीं पदसदृशीं वपामुदक्खिदत् उत्खियोद्धृतवान्. So,
we get that it is like a sheet capable of being torn out.

The fact that it is not only पदसदृशी, but also उदरमध्यवर्तिनी,
makes me think that it is the diaphragm and that it has nothing
to do with the heart

That it is different from the heart is shown by Hiranyakeśi
Grhya Sūtra (ed. Kīrste) 2 15.5— संज्ञमायं तूष्णीमग्निः प्राणानाप्याप्य
तूष्णीं वपां हृदयं मतले उद्धरति. In view of this, ' वपा हृदयस्थवानुविशेषः '
can hardly be maintained

Finally, as regards the position of the वपा in the cavity of the
torso, we have in Āśvalāyana Grhya Sūtra (ed. Ganapati Śāstri)
1. 9 10— संज्ञप्य पुरा नामेस्तृणमंतर्याय वपाम् उत्खिय etc. Haradatta, in
his Anāvīlā tīkā to this passage, says— पुरा नामेरिति वपास्थाननिर्देशः
नामेरवामित्यर्थः That is the position of the diaphragm in the body.

Considering all the above factors, there can be no doubt that
वपा is the diaphragm. Otherwise it will not be possible to make
seven holes in it, or to cover a man's face with it, or make possi-
ble the use of वपाश्रवणी, and वपावहन would accordingly mean its
muscular attachments all round the abdominal cavity, forming
its support.

III स्तेन, तस्कर

Apte and Monier Williams agree in saying that both स्तेन and
तस्कर mean " thief, robber ". It is perfectly clear that a " thief " is
not the same thing as a " robber " I shall presently show that
स्तेन and तस्कर are not quite the same thing.

We have in Mb. 12, 259. 7 (C P) —

यथाऽधर्मसमाविष्टो धनं गृह्णाति तस्करः ।

रमते निर्हरंस्तेन परचित्तमराजके ॥

Unfortunately, Nilakantha does not say anything here. But it is obvious that स्तेन is something different from तस्कर. Wherein lies the difference?

From what I have found, स्तेन means A thief, i. e., one who takes stealthily. And तस्कर means a robber, i. e., one who takes openly, i. e., with violence, a dacoit.

This will be seen from R. V. 7m. 55 3—स्तेन राय सारमेय तस्करं वा पुनःसर, where Śāyana says प्रच्छन्नधनापहारी स्तेनः ... प्रत्यक्ष-धनापहारी तस्करः ।

This idea is also expressed in Śābara Bhāṣya to Mīmāṃsā darśana, 1. 2 11—यथा स्तेना प्रच्छन्नरूपाः ।

There is another distinction made between स्तेन and तस्कर on the basis, not of the mode of taking as above, but on that of the value of things taken by them. स्तेन is one who takes things of comparatively smaller value; तस्कर is one who takes things of great value. This distinction is mentioned in A. V. 19. 50. 5.—

अप स्तेन वासो मोअजमुत तस्करम् ।

अथो यो अर्वतः शिरोभिधाय निनीषति ॥

The man who steals clothes, cows and goats is a स्तेन, and तस्कर is a man who steals horses. Śāyana says here—स्तेनतस्करयोः पर्यायत्वेऽपि अपहार्यद्रव्यगौरवेण पृथगपहननम् उक्तम् इति वेदितव्यम् ।

IV. शातकुंभ, जांबूनद

Taking शातकुंभ first of all, both Apte and Monier Williams say simply "gold". But it means "silver" as well. Bhatta Utpala tikā to Varāhamihira's Brhat Samhitā, 12. 20, says—शातकुंभशब्दः सुवर्णरजतयोर्द्वयोरपि वाचकः ।

Then, as regards जांबूनद and शातकुंभ, Apte says about both simply "gold". Monier Williams says s. v. शातकुंभ simply "gold" and s. v. जांबूनद 'gold from the Jambu river, any gold'. They seem both to rely on Amarakośa 2 9. 94-95,

From what I have found it seems that they were different metals, जांबूनद being the more prized of the two Mb 13 85 83 (C P.)

एवं सुवर्णमुत्पन्नमपत्यं जातवेदसः ।

तत्र जांबूनदं श्रेष्ठं देवानामपि भूषणम् ॥

What was the distinction between the two? जांबूनद was reddish and शातकुंभ was white. Not that शातकुंभ was not valuable; it was only less valued than जांबूनद, that is all.

The fact that जांबूनद was reddish appears from the following—
तत्र जांबूनदं नाम कनकं देवभूषणम् ।

इंद्रगोपकसंकाशं जायते भास्वरं तु तद् ॥ Mb. 6, 7, 26 (CP).

जांबूनद इवादीप्तः प्रदीपज्वलनो यथा । Harivamśa, 2, 98, 47.

That gold of this description was found in the mountains of India is beyond doubt. See Beal, "Si-yu-ki", Book xii, (Vol. II, p 298) where Hiuen Tsang speaks of gold that is found in Po-lo-lo (Bolor, modern Balti or Baltistan in north Kashmir) and says it is 'as red as fire'.

In Mb. 1. 221 52 (C. P.) = J. 218. 46 (B. O. R. I.), we have
कुताकुतस्य मुख्यस्य कनकस्याग्निवर्चसः ।

As regards the distinction between the two, we have

जांबूनदमयान्यस्य शातकुंभमयानि च ।

प्रदीपज्वलनामानि शीतरश्मिनिमानि च ॥ Harivamśa, 2. 6 4. 4.

After this, I think, there cannot be any manner of doubt that शातकुंभ and जांबूनद are not synonymous. To say that both are "gold" would be incorrect. In fact, while जांबूनद appears to be gold, शातकुंभ seems to be a valuable metal, no doubt, but not gold at all. It is white in colour against the yellow of the gold, and may be, for aught I know, something like platinum or some similar white metal, whose colour was not, for some reason known to them, preferred to that of gold. They were both सु-वर्ण, but not सुवर्ण both of them.

V. कुल, वंश, जाति.

I have found the following passages illustrating the use of the above words:—जात्रा च सदृशाः सर्वे कुलेन सदृशास्तथा Mb. 12. 107. 30 (CP), उदात्तकुलजातीय उदात्ताभिजनः सदा Mb. 13. 145 31 (CP).

These two passages show कुल and जाति mentioned together. There must be some distinction. Nilakantha does not say anything. I have not been able to discover anything in Amarakośa,

Śabdakalpadruma, Aptā or Monier Williams, which would indicate the distinction.

Similarly कुलवशप्रतिष्ठां हि पितरः पुत्रमनुवन् Mb. 1. 74. 98 (CP) = 1. 69. 17 (B. O. R. L.); रत्नभूमिं प्रदद्यात् तु कुलवंशं प्रवर्धयेत् Mb. 13. 66. 32 (CP).

Here कुल and वंश. Here also Nilakantha is silent, and I have not found anything in the four books just mentioned.

I found the answer, however, in the Inscription of Daśaratha in Dilwārā Temple, Mt Abu, dated Samvat 1201 (published in the Nāgarī Pracārini Patrikā of Benares, Vol. 18, Sam. 1994, p. 235) — श्रीश्रीमालकुलोत्थानिमलतरप्राग्वाटवंशावरे स्राजच्छीतकरोपमो गुणनाथिः श्रीनिजकारुण्यो गृही ।

Ninnaka's mother's family was श्रीमाल and his father's family प्राग्वाट or पेरवाट.

This shows that कुल means "mother's family", i. e., the family in which the mother was born, while both जाति and वंश, being contrasted with कुल, mean the "father's family".

VI. बिडाल, मार्जार, वृषदश.

Amarakośa 2. 5. 6. says ओतुर्विडालो मार्जारी वृषदशक आखुमुक् . This is another of the places where Amarakośa is wrong. It is wrong in so far as it identifies वृषदश with बिडाल and मार्जार.

Mb. 9. 44. 25 (C. P.) says—

व्याघ्रसिंहर्क्षवदना बिडालमकराननाः ।

वृषदशमुखाश्चान्ये गजोद्भवदनास्तथा ॥

Similarly, Mb 9. 45. 80 (C P.) says—

मार्जारशशवक्त्राश्च दीर्घवक्त्राश्च भारत ।

and Mb. 9. 45. 84 (C. P.) says—

गोखरोद्भूमुखाश्चान्ये वृषदशमुखास्तथा ।

Unfortunately, Nilakantha does not say anything at any of these places, except बिडालवृषदशो मार्जारजातिभेदौ at 9. 44. 25.

But this much is certain from the above passages that वृषदंश is neither बिडाल nor मार्जार. That बिडाल and मार्जार both mean "cat" may be taken to be undisputed. At least, there is no reason to think that they are different.

But what is वृषदंश ? And is it really different from मार्जार ? The answer is given by *Suśruta Samhitā*, 1 46. 70 and 76. The former passage reads सिंहव्याघ्रवृकतरक्षुकक्षदीपिमार्जारशृगालमृगैर्वाहक-प्रभृतयो युहाशयाः i. e., मार्जार, along with animals like the lion and the tiger, is a cave-dweller, it lives in natural caves.

The latter passage reads गोधाशशवृषदंशलोपाकलोमशकर्णकदली-मृगप्रियकाजगरसर्पशुषिकनकुलमहाबभ्रुप्रभृतयो बिलेशयाः ।

i. e., वृषदंश, along with animals like the hare, the snake, the mouse and the mungoose, is a 'burrow-dweller', i. e., it is a burrowing animal. Exactly what sort of animal it is I have not been able to find, but this much is, to me, certain that it is *not* a cat.

Apte says it is a 'cat'. Monier Williams says—' a cat ; a kind of animal living in holes, *Susr* '

Apte and Monier Williams, in so far as they say 'cat' rely evidently on *Amarakośa* above referred to and must be held to be wrong.

If this passes muster with the Editor, I shall try and send some more of this sort as soon as I can manage.

Finally, I do not know, but the language of this article in some places may be thought to be of presumptuous carping criticism. But I hope not to be misunderstood. I am not a Sanskritist, but an humble student of Sanskrit, an Indian who is earnestly trying to understand the language of his forefathers correctly. He is grateful for everything he receives by way of instruction. But, at the same time, he does feel disgruntled if he finds that the instruction in any particular case was wrong. There is one good side to this, however ; this dissatisfaction spurs him on to enquiries, and, so, on towards truth. And, who knows, to Truth ? That is all that I have to say.

II

I नेत्र, अक्षि.

नेत्र, and अक्षि are said by Amarakośa, 2. 6. 93, to be synonymous. But it seems नेत्र means the entire eye, and अक्षि the iris only. प्रचंडघोणः पृथुदीर्घनेत्रः ताम्रायताक्षः कुरुराज एव Mb 4 71 13 (C P) = 15 25. 5 (C. P.)

II. शिष्य, अंतेवासी

They are not really synonymous.

शिष्य is a pupil for Vedic lore, and अंतेवासी one for handicrafts and the like. Smṛticandrikā (ed Gharpure), II p 174 तथा च नारदः (१, १२)—“शिष्यांतेवासीदासस्त्रीप्रेष्यकृत्यकरेभ्य यत् । कुटुंबहेतोराक्षिप्तं दातव्यं तत् कुटुंबिना ॥” शिष्यो वेदविद्यार्थी । शिल्पविद्यार्थी अंतेवासी । So also in Mitāksarā to Yāj. Sm. 2, 182

III. कपोत, पारावत

Amarakośa makes them synonymous 2. 5 14

But they are really different, कपोत being the dove and पारावत the pigeon. The first is inauspicious, and the second auspicious

कपोत is said to be the messenger of Nirrti in R V 10. 165. 1 This Sūkta is directed to be recited if a dove enters a house Brhat Samhitā, ch. 45, sl 71-72. See also Brhat Samhitā, ch. 87 sl. 12-13 In Bhāgavatam, 1. 14. 14, कपोत is described as सृष्ट्यदुत.

Caraka Samhitā, 6. 4. 32, Smṛticandrikā, III, p 428, and Mb. 13. 104. 114-5 (C.P.) all agree in saying that कपोत is inauspicious, and पारावत is auspicious

कपोत is of three kinds, आपांडुर, चित्रकपोत and कुंकुमध्व Bhatta Utpala's ūkā to Brhat Samhitā 87, 1, as also ibid, 87. 12-13. It appears that this division is known in the United Provinces even now. The आपांडुर variety is known as टोडू, the चित्रकपोत as चित्रक, and the कुंकुमध्व as सरोति. Sometimes, a fourth class is made out by splitting कुंकुमध्व into कुंकुम and ध्व, the कुंकुम being the सरोति and the ध्व the कला (dark).

IV. आवाह, विवाह

आवाहाश्च विवाहाश्च सह सूतेमया कृता Mb. 5, 141, 14 (C. P.) = 5, 139, 14 (B. O. R. I.); आवाहाश्च विवाहाश्च यज्ञाश्चात्रमृते तथा । निवर्तते नरश्रेष्ठ ब्रह्म चात्र प्रलीयते ॥ Mb. 13, 63, 33 (C. P.).

That there must be some distinction is obvious. Nothing in Nilakantha, Apte or Monier Williams to indicate it.

It seems both are invitations to marriages. आवाह is invitation to the bridegroom's house—what we in Bengal call बग्यात्र, and विवाह is invitation to the bride's house what we in Bengal call कन्यायात्र.

This is shown in Vātsyāyana Kāmasūtra, 4. 1, 15—आवाहे विवाहे षडे गमनं सखीभिः मह गोप्त्री देवताभिर्गमनमित्यनुज्ञाता कुर्यात् ।

Here Jayamangalā tikā says—आवाहे वरगृहे, विवाहे कन्यागृहे ।

V विवाह, उद्वाह

They are not synonymous. There is nothing to show the distinction in either Apte or Monier Williams.

विवाह means the first "half" of the entire marriage ceremony. It takes place in the bride's house and goes on upto (but not including) the departure of the newly-married couple for their home. The second "half" of the ceremonies is called उद्वाह, beginning with the boarding of the रथ by the newly-married couple and ending at the bridegroom's house with a पवणूणांजलिहोम. Śāyana, Intr. to AV. 14, 1, 1 says—विवाहः । स कुमार्याः पितृगृहे । .. .कुमारीं तत्पाद् उत्थापयति... ..इति विवाहः॥ अथोद्वाहः । तत्र वरस्य गृहे वधूनयनम् . . . तेनैव सूक्तेन यवानाम् आज्यमिश्राणां पूणांजलिं जुहोति । इत्युद्वाहः ।

VI नारी, स्त्री

They are not exactly synonymous. स्त्री means woman in general. नारी is a woman who is super-excellent among women. आर्ताऽऽर्ते मुदिते प्रीता नार्यं स्त्रीषु सा भवेत् ।

Nītimāñjarī (Dvā Dviveda), sl 114 Dvā Dviveda explains the distinction—

अर्यः स्वामी आर्ते दुःखिनि आर्ता दुःखिता, तस्मिन् मुदिते सति या प्रीता मुदिता, सा स्त्री नारी भवेत्, "यतश्च निर्धारणम्" (पा. २, ३, ४) इति सप्तमी । अन्या न ।

VII. इंद्र, महेंद्र.

They are not synonymous.

देवताश्चोपांशुयाजैर्महेंद्रवर्जम्—Āśval. Gr. Sūt.-1, 10, 4.

इंद्रं निगमेषूपलक्षयेदिंद्रयाजिनो महेंद्रं महेंद्रयाजिनः—Āpast. Śr. Sūt. 2, 2, 7.

इंद्र was worshipped by those who had not attained prosperity, but were anxious to do so महेंद्र could not be worshipped by anybody who had not succeeded in attaining prosperity.

नाऽगतभीमहेंद्रं यजेत Āpast Śrauta Sūtra, 1. 14 9

VIII. काद्रवेय, नाग.

Amarakośa 1. 8. 4 makes काद्रवेय and नाग synonymous, leaving out सर्प. As a matter of fact, it is undeniable that both नाग and सर्प are काद्रवेय, i e, children of कद्रु

I recall अर्बुदो नाम काद्रवेयः सर्पऋषिः Durgācārya to Nir 2. 5, and Sāvana to R. V 10. 94. 1—कद्रुवा पुत्रस्य सर्पस्याऽर्बुदस्यार्षम्

IX कीर्ति, यशस्.

Amarakośa 1, 5 11 (and Apte and Monier Williams) make them synonymous But Mb 12 54 32 (C P.) says—

यावद्वि प्रथते लोके पुरुषस्य यशो भुवि ।

तावन् तस्याक्षया कीर्तिर्भवतीति विनिश्चिता ॥

Obviously कीर्ति and यशस् are not the same thing Nilakantha explains यशः परचित्तचमस्कृतिजनकं गुणौघः । कीर्तिः साधुतयाऽन्यैः कथनम् ।

Thus यशस् means "the superior qualities of a man which impresses others", and कीर्ति "the appreciative talks about him by other people".

X कर्तु, यज्ञ.

Neither Apte nor Monier Williams makes any distinction between the two

Viṣṇu Purāṇa 4 13. 136 says अयमपि यज्ञादन्तरमन्यत्कस्वन्तरं तस्यान्तरमन्ययज्ञांतरं चाजस्रमविद्धिन्नं यजतीति

Mb. 6. 33. 16 (C P.) = Gītā, 9. 16 says अहं कर्तुरहं यज्ञः ।

Here Śamkarācārya Bhāṣya says कर्तुः श्रौतः कर्मभेदोऽहमेवाऽहं यज्ञः स्मार्तः ।

XL क्रोध (कोप), अमर्ष.

Amarakośa, 1, 7. 26 treats these as synonymous, and so do Apte and Monier Williams.

But

क्रोधामर्षौ समुत्पद्य संप्रतस्थे दिवं तदा Mb. 1, 228, 23 (C. P.) = 1, 219, 19 (B. O. R. I.), which reads क्रोधः, सक्रोधामर्षजिह्वभूस-
कषायदृशस्तथा Mb. 1, 96, 17 (B. O. R. I.); क्रोधं बलममर्षं च यो
निधाय परंतपः । जितारम्भा पांडवोऽमर्षी भ्रातृस्तिष्ठति शासने ॥ Mb. 5, 90,
25 (C. P.) = 5, 88, 26 (B. O. R. I.); उवाच सारथि तत्र क्रोधामर्ष-
समन्वितः Mb. 7, 115, 4 (C. P.) Nilakantha does not say any-
thing at any of these places

We have in Visṇu Purāṇa, 1. 13. 27—ततस्ते मुनयः सर्वे क्रोधामर्ष-
समन्विताः Here Śrīdhara in his Ātmaprakāśa tīkā says क्रोधश्च
अमर्षश्च भगवच्चिदाजनितौ ताभ्यां समन्विताः Viṣṇucitta tīkā here says
अमर्षोऽनेनितिक्षा

So, क्रोध (or कोप) is 'Anger'. अमर्ष is "the state of impatience
or impetuosity (or incapacity to put up with the circumstances),
being the result of extreme anger".

The reader will have noticed that I have considered प्रयोग to
be not only very important, but the very touchstone for lexico-
graphers. In fact in so many cases, my view is that प्रयोग shows
that the lexicographer is wrong. I say this on the basis of a fair
collection of passages critically considered (of course, according
to my lights) in my interleaved copies of Apte and Monier
Williams.

In this view, a new Dictionary of Sanskrit, on the lines of
Murray's Oxford English Dictionary, or of its less known
predecessor, Fallon's 'Hindustani-English Dictionary, is a
desideratum.

That it is not a "one-man job" is sure enough, particularly
when the language is Sanskrit

And I recall to my mind

सर्वः सर्वं न जानाति सर्वज्ञो नास्ति कश्चन ।

नैकत्र परिनिष्ठास्ति ज्ञानस्य पुरुषे कश्चित् ॥

But can it be difficult of achievement, if a batch of Sanskrit-
tists, who have made intensive and extensive study of the
language, put their heads together for a number of years?

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF HINDU FESTIVALS—
SOME NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF DIVĀLĪ FESTIVAL

—(BETWEEN C. A. D. 50 AND 1945)

BY

P. K. GODE

All festivals have a unifying influence in social and national life. Students of the cultural history of a nation must understand the genesis and development of these festivals and record their history with as much precision and detail as possible. The oldest living civilizations on this globe have contributed not a little to the growth of these festivals, which are a regular feature of national life. To whatever class of people these festivals may belong they have a peculiar human appeal. In India with its numerous religious beliefs we have quite a bewildering variety of religious and semi-religious festivals but unfortunately much of the writing¹ devoted to these festivals is of a descriptive type, in which no attempt is made to fathom the depths of available historical sources with a view to reconstructing any reliable history worth the name.

In 1916 one author who calls himself "*Rogredī*"² published a book called *History of Aryan Festivals*³ (आर्यव्यवसाय इतिहास) in

¹ The provincial *Gazetteers* of India contain much useful information about many of these festivals but it is of a descriptive type. The history of each festival ought to be studied in the form of monographs as a preliminary to an encyclopaedic history of Indian Festivals. At present our knowledge of the history of festivals is rather nebulous. We cannot say when a particular festival originated and how it developed through centuries of our cultural history. Mere descriptions of the present-day festivals, however enchanting, do not prove their antiquity as these descriptions are a mixture of legends and here-say evidence with many regional variations, from which it is difficult to comprehend the origin and development of these festivals.

² This book was published in Bombay. The Preface of the author is dated 3rd April 1916. This book appears to have enjoyed a wide popularity as will be seen from the *opinions* printed at the end of the volume. The author deals with such topics as—(1) Rise of Indian Astronomy, (2) Seasons, (3) Months, (4) *Adhikamāsa* (intercalary month), (5) Seven days
(continued on the next page)

Marathi. This is perhaps the only book in Marathi which devotes no less than about 370 pages to the study of Hindu festivals but even here one fails to find any history as such of each festival which has governed the life of our ancestors for hundreds of years. This attempt is, however, praise-worthy as it is perhaps the only conscious effort to meet a long-felt want about the history of our festivals. In dealing with each festival the author records valuable information about its currency in different regions of India, the ritual connected with it and the present manner of its celebration. The remarks of the author on the historical background of each festival are suggestive but not comprehensive for want of fully documented study about its origin and development. The author tells us in his Preface that his book is not written for the learned reader. All the same we must thank him for this pioneer¹ attempt, which is sufficiently conscientious and learned within the limitations under which he had to work and thus provide a readable account of Hindu or Aryan festivals as they are observed in India in the different months of one Hindu year.

(continued from the previous page)

of the week, (6) *Samvatsara-phala*, (7) different *Śakas*, (8) Seasonal Festivals and Historical Festivals (pp. 16-17), (9) *Samvatsara-Pratipadā*, (10) *Rāmanavamī*, (11) *Dolotsava*, (12) *Gaurī-Utsava*, (13) *Akṣayya-Trītiyā*, (14) *Parāśurāma-Jayanti*, (15) *Nṛsiṃha-Jayanti*, (16) *Gango-tsaṅga* or *Dakṣaḥarā*, (17) *Vaṣa-Sāvitṛi*, (18) *Mahā-Ekādāśi*, (19) History of *Cāturmāsā*, (20) *Nāgapanicamī*, (21) *Maṅgalā-Gaurī*, (22) *Śrāvanī*, (23) *Povāṇi Paurṇimā*, (24) *Nāṇāṇi-Paurṇimā*, (25) *Śrī Kṛṣṇa-Janmāṣṭamī*, (26) *Pūthorī-Amūvāsyā*, (27) *Polā* or *Vṛṣabhotsava*, (28) *Haritālīkā*, (29) *Ganeśa-Caturthī*, (30) *Rṣi-Pañcamī*, (31) *Jyēṣṭhā-Gaurī*, (32) *Vāmana-dvādāśī*, (33) *Ananta-Caturdaśī*, (34) *Mahālaya-Pakṣa*, (35) *Navarātra-Mahotsava*, (36) *Viṣayā-daśamī*, (37) *Rāmaliṅā*, (38) *Dipāvali-Mahotsava* (धनत्रयोदशी or धनेतरस, नारकचतुर्दशी, लक्ष्मीपूजन), (39) *Bali-pratipadā*, (40) *Yama-dvītiyā*, (41) *Tulasī-vivāha*, (42) *Dhātṛipūjana*, (43) *Vaikuṇṭha-Caturdaśī*, (44) *Tripurī-Paurṇimā*, (45) *Campā-saṭthī*, (46) *Datta-Jayanti*, (47) *Makara-Sankramana*, (48) *Vasanta-Pañcamī*, (49) *Ratha-Saptamī*, (50) *Mahāśivarātra*, (51) *Phālguna-Utsava* or *Holi*

¹ I must not fail to mention here a still earlier book on Hindu festivals. This is called "*Hindu Holidays*" by Balaji Sitaram Kothare, printed at the Times Press, Bombay, 1904, pages 100. The author contributed his articles on this subject to the *Times of India* in the years 1900 and 1901 and these have been presented in a book-form with the above title. About festivals the

(continued on the next page)

According to Rgvedi the Hindu festivals can be roughly classified¹ as follows —

(1) *Festivals originating from Ritus or Seasons* :—

संवत्सर प्रतिपदा, अक्षय्यवृत्तीया, चातुर्मास श्रावणी, नारळी पौर्णिमा, विजयादशमी, दीपावली, धात्रीपूजन, मकरसंक्रांत, वसंतपंचमी, होळी व शिमगा

(2) *Historical (Antihīstika) Festivals* :—

श्रीरामनवमी, परशुरामजयंती, दशहरा, कृष्णजन्माष्टमी, वामनद्वादशी ?

(3) *Sāra Festivals* —

त्रिपुरी पौर्णिमा, महाशिवरात्र

(4) *Vaisnavi Festivals* —

नृसिंहजयन्ती, महाएकादशी, अनंतचतुर्दशी, वैकुण्ठचतुर्दशी, दोलासव

(continued from the previous page)

author rightly observes — " The life of a nation is best depicted by the description given of its festivals, and the Hindus, being a civilized nation from remote antiquity have had their own holidays both to create and express joy. Hero-worship, religious devotion, social enjoyments, and the observance of particular rites and ceremonies, with definite object in view such as preservation of women from widowhood, freedom from the guilt of committing heinous crimes, the preservation of children from death in infancy, the acquisition of wealth, the restoration of lost power, fortune or kingdom, the remembrance, worship or feeding of the departed spirits of ancestors have their characteristic holidays " — The book deals briefly with the account of the following Holidays — (1) *Gudi Padva, Ramanavami,* (2) *Hanuman Jayanti,* (3) *Vata Purnima,* (4) *Ashadi Ekadashi,* (5) *Naq Panchami,* (6) *Coconut Day,* (7) *Janma and Gokul Ashtami,* (8) *Pithori Amavasia,* (9) *Ganesha Chaturthi,* (10) *Gauri,* (11) *Vaman Dwadashi,* (12) *Anant Chaturdashi,* (13) *Hindu anniversary Days,* (14) *Navaratra Festival,* (15) *Dacara,* (16) *Kojagari Purnima,* (17) *Dewali,* (18) *Four Hindu Holidays,* (19) *Datta Jayanti,* (20) *Makara Sankranti,* (21) *Mahashivaratra,* (22) *Holi Festival*

¹ This classification is good enough so far as it goes. It is only after a thorough historical study of each festival is recorded that an accurate classification can be given. As regards the ritual and belief connected with some of the Hindu festivals see *Keys of Power* by J. Abbott (Methuen & Co, London, 1932). I note some points from this book about the *Diwāli* :— *Diwāli*, 204-205, maidens wave arts at D. 63, 183, impression of hand made on cattle at D. 132, Oil applied to the body at D. 159, Lights waved before cattle at D. 184, Foot-prints drawn at D. 146, Worship of implements at D. 230, Manavadi days during D. 252, Use of red water at D. 282, Seed-drill dressed in garments of a woman at D. 357, Worship of Laksmi on the threshing at D. 369, Pole of the threshing-floor cut at D. 370; Grinding forbidden at D. 480 — It would be useful to study the history and chronology of these practices from datable sources, Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit.

(5) *Kantumbika Festivals* :—

वटसावित्री, मंगलगौरी, पिठोरी अमावास्या, हरितालिका, ऋषिपंचमी

(6) *Ākṣa Festivals* :—

गौरी-उत्सव, ज्येष्ठगौरी, ललितापंचमी, सरस्वती, देवी नवरात्र
चंपाष्टी (?)

(7) *Saura Festivals* — रथसप्तमी

(8) *Gānapatya Festivals* — गणेशचतुर्थी

For studying the regional variations in the celebration of different Hindu festivals one must get first-hand information about these festivals from the residents of the different regions, where these festivals are observed. In the absence of this information we can get some information about them in the *Provincial Gazetteers*,¹ some of which were written in a scholarly manner and hence may serve as a useful starting point for a historical study of the different festivals as they show the currency or otherwise of these festivals in different regions, where some of the old traditions have been preserved. We must, however, go from the present to the past and thus try to study when and how the details of these festivals have originated and thus enriched the social, religious and cultural life of India

¹ The *Bombay Gazetteer* contains the following references to *Divālī* holidays — Vol. IX, pt. 1, 23, note 5, 54, 82, 119, 151, 170, 173, 175, 178, 303, 305, 306, 316, 336, Festival days among Bhils, *id.*, pp. 305-306, Fire-worship on—*id.*, 357, Days for settling accounts by traders, *id.*, 82, Period best suited to subject evil spirits, IX, pt. II, 145, Hindu New year considered an evil spirit time, *id.*, 148, Buddhist Holidays XIV, 145, among Pātāne Prabhus, XVIII, pt. 1, 251-253, among Kunbis, *id.*, 294-295

The *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* contains some references to *Divālī* (see IV, 607a, *Ahīr*, I, 232b, 233a, *Bhil*, II, 555b, *Davars*, V, 3a, *Dravidian*, V, 3a, 14a, 19ab, *Pavars* V, 19b, *Sacrifice*, V, 14a) — The description of *Dravidian Divālī* (V, 19ab) has the following features —

- (1) *Lights* are used probably as a means of expelling evil spirits.
- (2) *Sacrifice* of goats and fowls before stones, painted red after bringing them from a neighbouring river-bed
- (3) *Dancing* and feasting, attended with lighted torches
- (4) Cattle are decorated with colour and garlands and a figure of the cattle-god *Balindā* is made and kept in the cow-shed.
- (5) Procession of the fiercest bull and the swiftest heifer through the village — Any lad who can snatch a garland from the bull or heifer is considered a fit match for the best girl in the neighbourhood.

In his article¹ on *Dvāḥ-Folklore* Mr. B. A. Gupte observes :—
 "Holidays in all countries have their folklore, and the *Divāli* of India is no exception. The greater the number of folk-tales, the higher the stage of development in the society, and the greater the interest we find attached to the evolution of the festivities." Mr Gupte then records half a dozen different folk notions, of which No. V is as follows :—

"The fifth idea has a *historical* basis. It is that King Vikramāditya of Ujjain, a scion of the Gupta race was crowned on this day, the 16th of Asvin and counted his era accordingly. This is thus a New year's day." From the multiplicity of accounts of the origin of *Divāli* Mr Gupte discloses the following points — (1) the change of the season, (2) the death of the rice-crop harvest, (3) the time of manuring the soil for the Second crop, (4) the Sun reaching Libra, the Seventh sign of the Zodiac, (5) the coronation of Rāma, and (6) the selection of this coronation day for the conventional coronation and era-making day of Vikramāditya, the last of the Guptas. In the Plate of *Divāli Drawings* (drawn by women from the 8th day of the 2nd half of *Āśvin* to *Divāli*) accompanying Mr Gupte's article we find the following symbols :— (1) Temple ascribed to *Lakṣmī Nārāyaṇa*, (2) the Sun, (3) the Moon, (4) hanging lamps, (5) *Śankha* Shell, (6) the mace, (7) the lotus, (8) the wheel, (9) the *Svastika*, (10) the *Śeṣa* or thousand-hooded cobra, (11) the cow's foot-prints, (12) sparrows, (13) the mango (14) the bel (wood-apple) tree and (15) the foot-prints of *Lakṣmī*. According to Mr Gupte "the presence of sparrows at harvest time, the position of the threshing floor usually near a shady tree, and the incoming realization of the sale-proceeds (wealth) as expressed by the foot-prints are significant. This is perhaps the most primitive origin of the festival."

In the *Hobson-Jobson* (by Yule and Burnell, London, 1903, pp. 208-309) we get some foreign notices of *Dvāḥ* from A.D. 1618 onwards. I reproduce here these notices with the remarks of the editors —

Dewally, S. H. *duwalī*, from Skt. *dīpa-ālūkā*, 'a row of lamps' i. e. an illumination. An autumnal feast attributed to the celebration of various divinities, as of *Lakshmī* and of *Bhagvāni*, and also in honour of Krishna's slaying of the demon *Naraka*, and the release of 16000 maidens, his prisoners. It is held on the last two days of the dark half of the month of *Āṣvīn* or *Āṣān* and on the new moon and four following days of *Kārttika* i. e. usually some time in October. But there are variations of Calendar in different parts of India and feasts will not always coincide e. g. at the three Presidency towns nor will any curt expression define the dates. In Bengal, the name *Duwalī* is not used, it is *Kālī Pūjā*, the feast of that grim goddess, a midnight festival on the most moonless nights of the month, celebrated by illuminations and fireworks on land and river, by feasting, carousing, gambling and sacrificing of goats, sheep and buffaloes.

A. D. 1613—" *Duwalī* "

—*Godinho de Eredia*, f. 38 v

A. D. 1623—" October the four and twentieth was the *Duwalī* or the feast of the Indian Gentiles "

—*P. Della Valle*, Hak. Soc. ii, 206

! D. 1651—" In the month of *October* eight days after the full moon there is a feast held in honour of *Vishnou* which is called *Dipāwālī* "

—*A. Rogerius*, *De Open-Deuren*

A. D. 1671—" In *October* they begin their year with great feasting, Jollity sending presents to all they have any busyness with which time is called *Duwalī* "

—*Hedges Diary*, Hak. Soc. ii, cccxiv

A. D. 1673—" The first New Moon in *October* is the *Banyan's Duwalī* "

—*Fryer*, 110.

A. D. 1690—"their Grand Festival Season called *Duwalī Time* "

—*Ovington*, 401.

A. D. 1820—"The *Dewallee*, *Deepaullee* or Time of Lights takes place 20 days after the *Dusseera* and lasts three days. during which there is feasting, illumination, and fireworks "

—*L. Coats in Tr. Ind. Soc. Bo.*, ii, 211.

A. D. 1813—"Nov 5 The *Dīwālī*, happening to fall on this day, the whole river was bright with lamps . . . Ever and anon some votary would offer up his prayers to *Lakshmi the Fortuna* and launch a tiny raft bearing a cluster of lamps into water,—then watch it with fixed and anxious gaze. If it floats on till the far distance hides it thrice happy he . . . but if, caught in some wild eddy of the stream it disappears at once, so will the bark of his fortunes be engulfed in the whirl pool of adversity."

—*Dry Leaves from Young Egypt*, 84

A. D. 1883—"The *Dīwālī* is celebrated with splendid effect at *Benares* . . . At the approach of nights small earthen lamps, fed with oil are prepared by millions and placed quite close together so as to mark out every line of mansion, palace, temple, minaret and dome in streaks of fire "

—*Monier Williams, Religious Thought and Life in India*, 432.

E. W. Hopkins in his article on *Hindu Festivals and Fasts* in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* 1912 (Vol V, pp. 867-871) classifies Hindu festivals as follows :—

(i) *Ancient Festivals* —

- (1) Moon-festival (seasonal)
- (2) ' Four-month celebration ' (seasonal).
- (3) Ceremony of First-fruits
- (4) Soma-sacrifice.
- (5) Consecration Ceremony.
- (6) Horse-sacrifice.
- (7) Solstice-feast
- (8) Twelve nights' Celebration.
- (9) Sacrifices at *tīrthas* by pilgrims

(ii) *Modern Festivals* :— These festivals are new in effect, though old in general character.

(1) *Lamp Festival* (*Devālī*) — The rites in honour of one god have passed over to another without materially altering the celebration and sometimes even to-day the same celebration is held in honour of different gods. Thus the very pleasing *lamp-festival* in which, in autumn, lamps are lighted in every direction, floating lamps are set off down rivers etc., is celebrated by some as a festival in honour of Viṣṇu's wife, and by others in honour of Durgā, the wife of Siva — Modern festivals have thrown off Brahmanism as far as possible, and are more clearly celebrations of the seasons, devoid of priestly ritual and self-sufficient.

(2) *Spring Festival* of Northern India (*Holi*) — Between the old and new there must have been a large number of special festivities now lost sight of, or only faintly reflected in intermediate literature—not to speak of many special festivities in honour of gods and goddesses described in the mediæval Purāṇic and Tantric literature—Some of the modern festivals are both Sectarian and Seasonal—In the devil-frightening festival viz. the "lamp-festival" (*Devālī*) the original intent of the celebration is merged in the worship of some modern deity.

(3) *Makaravṃkrānti* and others—

That there were many festivals not included under the screen of religious rites in ancient times may be taken for granted and this is supported by external evidence—Many of the Hindu festivals have a counter-part in those of other races

It is clear from the above grouping of Hindu festivals that the *Devālī* or "lamp-festival" is a *Modern festival* according to Hopkins,¹ who, however, does not say when it originated and developed its numerous features as we see them to-day.

¹ Hopkins records the following *Literature* pertaining Hindu Festivals and Fasts —

- (1) H. H. Wilson *Select Works*, II, London
Festivals of the Hindus "
- (2) Natesa Sastrī *Hindu Fest., Fasts and ceremonies*,
- (3) W. J. Wilkins *Modern Hinduism*, Calcutta, 1900.
- (4) Monier Williams *Hinduism*, London, 1877.
- (5) F. K. Ginzel *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* Leipzig, 1906, ff., 1 310-402.
- (6) E. W. Hopkins *Religions of India*, Boston, 1895 (previous literature cited on pp. 448 and 592).

(continued on the next page)

In the above volume of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* there is an article by Margaret Stevenson on *Jain Festivals and Fasts* (pp. 875-879) In this article she describes the *Dwāli* of the Jains as follows —

“ Next to *Paryūṣaṇa* the greatest of all the Jain sacred seasons is *Dwāli*. If the former owes its importance to the emphasis which the Jains lay on the sin of killing, *Dwāli* derives its position from the importance of wealth to a mercantile community, the Jains. The Jains assign a special reason for their participation in what is really a Hindu festival in honour of *Lakṣmī*, the goddess of wealth. They say it originated when *Mahāvīra* passed to *mokṣa* and the eighteen confederate Kings and others who were present at his passing instituted an illumination, saying “ Since the light of intelligence is gone, let us make an illumination of material matter (see *Kalpa Sūtra*, *Sacred Books of the East*, xlii 2. 6)

The festival continues for four days, the last days of *Āśvina* which close the Hindu year and the first of *Kārtika*—falling usually within the months of *October* or *November*. Among the *Svetāmbara* Jains, the first day (*Dhanteras*) of the festival is devoted to polishing jewellery and ornaments in honour of *Lakṣmī*, on the second day (*Kāñchaulas*) the women try to propitiate evil spirits by giving them some of the sweetmeats they prepare and cook on this day. These they place in a circle at cross-roads (q v.) in order to protect their children from evil influences during the year. The third (*Amāsa*) is the great day of the feast. It was on this day that *Mahāvīra* went to *Mokṣa* and *Gautama Indrabhūti* attained to *Kaivalya*. This is the day on which Jains worship their account-books and decorate and illuminate their houses. In the morning Jains of all three sects go to their monasteries and convents and do reverence to the chief monk

(continued from the previous page)

- (7) J. C. Oman. *Brahmans, Theists, and Muslims of India*, London, 1907, (esp. p. 241 ff., The Holy Festival)
- (8) A. Hillebrandt. ‘ Die Sonnenwendfeste in Alt-Indien ’ in *Roman Forschungen*, V, (1889) 299-310 and *Vedische Opfer und Zauber*, Strassburg, 1897 (= *GIAP*, III, 2)
- (9) B. Lindner. *Das ind. Erntepfer*, in *Festgruss an Bohtlingh*, Stuttgart, 1888, pp. 79-81.
- (10) J. Jolly. *Recht und Sitte*, Strassburg, 1896 (= *GIAP* II, 3)

or nun present, who preaches to them on the life of Mahāvira and sings appropriate songs. The more devout lay people stay and do *posaha*, but the generality go home and make up their accounts for the year. In the evening they summon a Brāhman to direct the *śārādā pūjā* or worship of the account-books, for Brāhmanas are still the domestic chaplains of the Jains. The Jain having arranged his account-book on a stool, the Brāhman enters and paints a *chāndālo* (auspicious mark) on the Jain's fore-head, his pen and one page of the account-book. He then writes the word *śrī* (i. e. *Laksmī*) on the account-book, either five, seven or nine times in such a way as to form a pyramid. A rupee (the oldest possible) is now placed on the book, this rupee for the time being, is considered to be *Laksmī* herself and the placing of it is called *Laksmī-pūjā*. All the year the owner will carefully guard this particular coin as it is considered luck-bringing, and will use it again next *Dwālī*, so that in some Jain families the coin used is of great rarity and antiquity. Besides the coin, the leaf of a creeper is also placed on the account-book and the Jain waves a little lamp filled with burning camphor before the book, on which he has placed rice, *pūn*, betel-nut, turmeric and various kinds of fruit. The ceremony ends by sprinkling the books with red powder after which the Brāhman and the Jain feast on sweet-meats. The account-book is left open for several hours and before closing it they say: *Lakṣa lābhā, Lakṣa lābhā*, i. e. a hundred thousand profits.

The fourth and the last day of *Dwālī*, Newyear's Day, is the first day of the month of *Kārttika* and of the commercial year; and the Jains then go and greet all their friends much as we might on our New year's Day and send cards to those who are absent."

If the *Jaina Dwālī* originated with the death of Lord Mahāvira for which B. C. 528-7 is one of the traditionary dates¹ we can definitely say that it is about 2400 years old. Can we establish the antiquity of the *Hindu Dwālī* for such a period and also prove the exact starting point of its history? It is exactly for answering this question on the strength of documentary

¹ Vide p. 46 of *Early History of India* by Vincent Smith, Oxford, 1914 and p. 616 of *Madhyayugina-Caritra-Kośa* by S. Chitrava Shastri, Poona, 1937,

? [*Annals*, B. O. R., I.]

evidence that I have undertaken the present study. I shall, therefore, try to establish the antiquity of the *Hindu Divāli* as far back as documentary evidence can take it, leaving it to other investigators to improve upon my labours and give us a conclusive history and chronology of this most popular Hindu festival.

In view of the close parallelism between the *Hindu Divāli* and the *Jain Divāli* we are tempted to ask the following questions—

- (1) Which is the older of the two Divālis—*Jain* or *Hindu*?
- (2) Is it possible to suppose that the older of these two *Divālis* has influenced the younger one?

These questions cannot be answered satisfactorily unless we have reconstructed the history of both these *Divālis*. I shall, therefore, record in this paper some data which would reveal to a certain extent the historical background of these *Divālis* but before I do so I shall record a detailed description of the Hindu or Brahmanical Divāli as given by Margaret Stevenson in her book *Rules of the Twice-Born* (Religious Quest of India Series), London, 1920, pp 335-340. This description reads as follows—

‘The great *Feast of Lamps* (*Dipāvali*, *Dīpālī* or *Dīvālī*) occupies the last three days of the Indian year (the 13th, 14th and 15th of the dark half of the month of *Āśvina*) which are sacred to Lakṣmī, the goddess of wealth.

The *first* of these three days (the *Day of wealth-worship*, *Guj Dhana-terasa*) is extremely auspicious. Indeed, so invariably auspicious it is, that no astrologer need be consulted about a child being put to school for the first time that day, a move being undertaken, newly married brides being sent to their husband’s homes, or gold being given out to a goldsmith to fashion into jewellery.

As a rule, before this day there is bustle and stir, excursions and alarms in every Twice-born home, for the houses have to be white-washed throughout and decorated, the compound cleaned and the square before the door replastered and marked with a *Svastika* in chalk and coloured powder, and all the metal vessels, polished till they shine like gold, have to be arranged in glittering rows round the rooms in the ladies’ part of the house, all the ornaments, gold and silver, have similarly to be cleaned

and, if necessary, sent to the goldsmith's for repair; and all the bills called in and paid. Every old-fashioned house-hold has its own tailor, washerman and goldsmith, whose dues are paid once a year now at *Divālī*; for not one single debt may be left outstanding. This is the time too when new vessels and new cloth are first taken into use. Old-fashioned people, who do not trust in such new-fangled things as banks, take out their hoardings on this day, wash them in milk and worship them. A fine old chief in one part of India regularly worships a thousand gold *mohurs* on this day. He puts them all into a huge copper-dish, pours water over them and offers them the full sixteen-fold worship, giving alms to Brahmans at the close. All three days the children let off crackers, and help to illuminate their homes by putting lights on the gates. But on this first day the boys tie white strings and clips to the end of sticks to make buzzers (Guj *Bhambuda*)

These they whirl over their heads, so that their buzzing may frighten the cows. Any dust these animals kick up on this day is considered specially sacred, so the boys go and stand in the perfect dust-storm caused by the stampeding cows running away from the buzzers, and so acquire virtue without a trace of boredom!

The women with their spring cleaning finished, cook specially nice food and wear their best clothes. The houses not only of the Twice-born but of all the *Hindus* and also of *Jains* and *Parsis*, are illuminated, and there is universal rejoicing in the fact that all debts are paid, the harvest garnered and the rainy season over, so that every one seems happy, and the entire holiday is a festival of light-heartedness. Far different will be the following night!

The morning after the Day of Wealth-worship is still a time of gladness and rejoicing (*Rūpa Caturdasi, The Day of Beauty*). Men and women get up early take extra pains over their toilet, and wear their finest clothes. Every one is dressed before six, and they all have great fun calling on different friends, break-fasting with them and eating special dainties.

But the *Witches Night* (*Kāla Rātri*) that follows is a parlous time, the most hag-haunted season of the whole year, for then

all the evil ghosts of the wicked or of those who have died violent deaths, and the terrifying spectres of women who have died in child-birth, come out and walk the streets. But besides these black malignant spirits ordinary ghosts, demons, ghosts, wraiths and witches are also abroad. All through the year rash fools who wished to meet ghosts could find them after night fall when they haunt cemeteries and burning-grounds, or in the particular trees where they dwell, but on this 11th night of the dark of the moon of *Āshvina* they are not confined within their usual limits, but move freely, wherever they please.

So all wise people hide at home if they possibly can, especially if, like women or children, they are also very timid.

Hanumān, the special guardian against ghosts, has, you may be sure, more than the usual number of worshippers this night, who pour oil and red lead over him and offer him coco-nuts. In return his devotees take some of the oil that drips from his right foot, burn it with soot, and mark their eyes with it, for this not only ensures their being under the special protection of the god for the year, but also improves their sight for the same period.

Other people quiet the ghosts by making circles where four roads meet and put cakes of grain and pulse fried together in oil within the circle, and Indians of other than the Twice-born castes would worship certain mother goddesses within these circles.

Venturesome men who know the right *mantras* for laying ghosts sometimes try and get control over spirits on this night and go alone to the burning grounds. There they make a circle, either with cold iron or with water and sit carefully within its bounds keeping some pulse of a special kind (*Phaseolus radiatus*) near them.

All sorts of ghosts, ghouls, demons, fiends, and witches attack the man. If they come too near, he throws the pulse at them, and this frightens them off, and as long as he keeps a brave heart and repeats the right *mantras* 108 times without stumbling, all goes well, and he is their absolute master for the ensuing year. but if he steps outside the circle before the day dawns, or if for one moment during the terrible ordeal his heart fails him and he blanches, or if he stumbles as he repeats a *mantra*, he is in the fiends' power for ever.

Other Indians, such as Kolis, Bhils, and the low-castes go down on this night to the desolate places where corpses are burnt and, making similar circles, burn within them as sacrifices to terrible mother goddesses, such as *Muhākālī*, or *Bharavi*, or *Meludi*, offerings of evil forbidden food, spirits and meat and give them a *Sārī* of ceremony and bangles to wear

If inspite of all her tears, a woman has to go outside her house on this terrifying night, she walks very carefully, for there are circles drawn in every street and if she so much as put her foot inside one, an evil spirit will take possession of her. If, by some mischance, this terrible catastrophe does happen to her, she knows it, and so do her friends, by her constant shaking. Sometimes the woman herself says who the ghost is, how it came, and how to get rid of it.

The last day of the three is the greatest of all the *Diwālī* days. In the morning children get up early, bathe as soon as they are dressed, and let off crackers to their heart's content. The children have had a fine time all three days, for their elders believe that, if the children are indulged and kept happy in every possible way, the year will bring good fortune to both parents and children, you may be sure, make the most of so congenial a creed.

On this last day they take a cake of cow-dung, thrust in it a piece of sugar-cane for a holder and arrange on the cow-dung a tiny earthen lamp, in which a wick floating on sweet oil is kept burning. Carrying this light (*Guj Meriyum*) the children go round from house to house begging oil for their lamp, that their dead ancestors may get light.

Their elders spend the morning in meeting and entertaining their friends and preparing for what is the main ceremony of the three day's holiday, the *Worship of the Account-books*, by putting bigger lamps than ever in the windows of their houses, for this night the illuminations must be "gorgeous and grand". All the old accounts must be closed and the new ones opened, in preparation for the worship.

The astrologer fixes the exact moment for this all important rite to be performed.

The new account book is opened and on its third leaf a Brāhman writes the word *Śrī* (i.e. *Lakṣmī*, the goddess of wealth) over and over again in such a way as to form a pyramid of the syllable *Śrī*,

In the centre of this pyramid a betel-leaf is placed, and on it a current rupee, the newer the better

The five-fold worship is offered by the presiding Brāhman to the account-book still open at this page, concluding with *ārati*, and at the end the food offered is distributed to visitors and alms are given to the Brāhman, who in turn blesses his host, saying " May you be happy all the year "

Then as an omen, the rupee from the account-book is tossed up, and if it falls with a clear ringing sound, it is a lucky pre-sage for the new year

Afterwards every one gathers round to eat sugar and grain, sends trays of it to friends and lets off crackers

The account-book is kept open all night with a lamp burning beside it, and early in the morning the Brāhman returns. His host says to him three times "*Lakṣa Lābha*" (a hundred thousand profits) and the Brāhman replies " May you have a hundred and twenty-five thousand profits " and shuts the account-book

All night long every one in the house has kept awake and with the dawning of the new year they sally forth to wish their friends all happiness "

My object in reproducing the above description of the *Divālī* in extenso is two-fold . *Firstly* it will enable my readers to compare it with the descriptions of the *Divālī*, as current in the other regions of India and greater India, which may not have come under the direct observation of Mrs Stevenson , *Secondly* it will enable research scholars to see if any of the features of the *Divālī* celebration mentioned in this description have any early history for them and whether such history can be proved on documentary evidence of Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit sources. In studies pertaining to the culture of any nation the details of any feature of this culture are most important and need to be recorded with meticulous care so that they may give us as comprehensive a picture of this culture as possible on the strength of present observation and past history, backed up by historical

sources pertaining to different regions and periods. Every modern feature may not have any long history for it but it is possible to trace the history of some essential features of a festival to ancient times.

We have recorded the descriptions of the *Hindu* and the *Jain* *Devīlī* so far. Now let us record a description of the *Divālī* as observed in Greater India by people with Buddhist persuasion. In this connection some interesting information is found in the account of *Siamese Festivals and Fasts* by G. E. Gerini (Vide pp. 885-890 of *Ency of Rel and Ethics*, Vol. V) who informs us that Siamese festivals are traceable, as a rule, to either Brahmanism or Buddhism. These two creeds were introduced into Siam at a very early date and consequently Brahmanic and Buddhist rites were introduced into most of the national festivals and ceremonies. Speaking of the festivals observed in Siam in the month of *Kārttika* Mr Gerini notes (1) the *Feasts of lamps* which is a counterpart of Hindu *Divālī* or *Dīpāvalī* and (2) the *Kārttikeya Festival*, which is a state ceremony recently abolished, in honour of *Kārttikeya* (or *Skanda*, the Hindu Mars, son of *Siva*) and which is attended with the *floating of lamps*, and *bon-fires*. The *Siamese Divālī* is described by Mr Gerini as follows -

“ No. 20 *Feast of lamps (Karttika, 12th month)*—This embraces two distinct festivals (1) the hoisting of lamps on poles on new-moon day and the lighting of them at night, till the second day of the waning, when they are lowered, (2) the floating of lamps in the streams at night on the 14th, 15th and 16th days of the moon, with the eventual addition of fire-works. This second form of illumination seems however, to be connected more especially with the festival hereafter explained (No. 21) (On the other hand the aerial lanterns hoisted on poles, as aforesaid, are kept burning to scare away goblins as in time of epidemics (cf e. g. the *raksā-pradīpas*, and, it is believed, also to retain the water from draining off the paddy fields, for the ears of rice would not attain maturity if the yearly inundation were to abate so early. Hence the festival is a very popular one like its counterpart the *Divālī* or *Dīpāvalī* in India. They closely correspond although the *ākūṣapradīpas* (lamps raised on poles in the air) are in India lighted in honour of *Lakṣmī*. We have here to do essentially

with a festival in honour of Visnu and his consort, for it is known that on the 11th day of the new moon of Kārttika the god awakes from his four months sleep, and that his victory over king Bali (*Vāmana avatāra*) took place at this season. ”

Mr Gerini does not record any history of the Siamese festivals, hence it is difficult to say at what time the Divāli festival originated in Siam and continued to be observed somewhat on the lines of the Hindu Divāli. If the Siamese *Divāli* is a counterpart of the Hindu Divāli, its history is dependent on the history of the Hindu or Brahmanical Divāli, which we want to reconstruct in this paper.

Resuming now our reconstruction of the history of the Hindu Divāli, I have to record here an interesting account of the Divāli Festival as recorded in a Marathi chronicle¹ which states —

“Mahādji Saindia (*A. D. 1727-1794*) informed Peshwa Savai Mādhavarao (*A. D. 1774-1795*) as follows —

“The Divāli festival is celebrated for 4 days at *Kotā*,² when lares of lamps are lighted. The Raja of *Kotā* during these 4 days gives a display of fire-works outside the premises of his capital. It is called “*दाखी लंका*” or “*Lankā of fire-works*”. During this display the image of *Rāvana* is prepared and kept in the centre of the show. Images of *Rāksasas*, monkeys and a big image of *Hanūmān* are all prepared of gunpowder.³ The tale of *Hanūmān* is then set fire to, and Hanumān begins to fly in the air, setting fire to various houses in this *Lankā* of fireworks. Such a display is given by the Raja of *Kotā* during the Divāli Festival’

The Peshwa ordered Mahādji to give a similar display of fire-works for his entertainment. Mahādji made all preparations within 15 days and the display was carried out on a dark night

¹ देशभ्याची बखर by Krishnaji Vinayak Sohoni, ed by K. N. Sane, A. B. Press, Poona, 1925, Page 149 (I have rendered the pertinent extract into English from the Marathi original). The author of this *Bakhar* was possibly born during the reign of Peshwa Savai Mādhava Rao (Vide p. 266 of *पुर्णीत चरित्रकोश* by S. Chitrava, Poona, 1937)

² Modern *Kotah* State in Rajputāna.

³ Vide my paper on *Guns and Gun-powder in India—A. D. 1400 onwards* in *Sir Denison Ross Volume*, ed by P. K. Gode and S. M. Katre, pp. 117-124

before the Peshwa and his Sardars. The display took place at the foot of the *Parvati* hill and was witnessed by the Peshwa and his Sardars from the *Parvati* temple. It was a grand performance and was witnessed by the people of Poona in large numbers."

The use of fire-works in the celebration of the *Devāh*, which is so common in India now, must have come into existence after about 1400 A. D. when gun-powder came to be used in Indian war-fare. It is necessary to record the history of the use of fire-works in *Divālī* celebrations prior to the Peshwa period.

In the references to *Devālī* in the *Hobson-Jobson* the earliest notice of the *Devālī* by a foreign observer is dated A. D. 1618. Let us now go backwards from this date. In the *Ain-i-Akbari*¹ (about A. D. 1590) there is an account of *Festivals* in which we find the *Devālī* described as follows:

"Month of *Kārtika*—The second, ninth, eleventh and twelfth are also festivals. The *thirteenth* is the *Dīpālī* or row of lamps (Hind. *Devālī*). A difference occurs in the calculation of its date. According to the *Śuklapakṣa* computation it is as above stated but by the *Kṛṣṇa-pakṣa* (Hind. *Aghān*—Nov—Dec.) and they, therefore, hold this festival on the 15th of the *Kṛṣṇa-pakṣa* of *Kārtika*. Lamps are lit as on the (Muhammadan) festival of *Shāb-i-borāi*. It begins on the 29th and this night is considered auspicious for dicing and many strange traditions are told regarding it. It is the greatest of the festivals re. the *Vaiśya* caste"²

Emperor Akbar "participated in the celebration of *Dīpāvah* or *Devālī*, the festival of lamps" (*Ain*, I, 216)³

From the 16th century we may now go to the 15th century and see how the *Hindu Devālī* was celebrated within the jurisdiction of the Vijayanagar empire. In this connection Dr. B. A. Saletore has collected and recorded the following information about *Festivals, Games and amusements* in his volumes on *Social and Political Life in Vijayanagar Empire* (1934). In Vol. II (p. 387) he observes as follows—

"Another celebration which evoked admiration from foreign travellers was the *Dīpāvah* festival held in the month of *Kārtika*.

¹ Ed. by Jarrett, Vol II, 1894, Page 320

² "It is auspicious for all undertakings connected with commerce".

³ Vide p. 319 of *Ind. Histo Quarterly*, XIII (June, 1937). ✓

§ [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

This commemorates the victory which Visnu scored against the Asuras and Narakāsuras and since as they say it was won in the evening there is universal illumination of houses and temples in the land.¹

Conti thus describes the *Dipāvālī* festival — "On another of these festivals they fix up within their temples, and on the outside of the roofs an innumerable number of lamps of oil of Susimanni which are kept burning day and night"²

People gave contributions to the temples also for the celebration of these festivals. In about A. D. 1443 Govanna and Ballana sons of Śrīranga Deva of Aranipura in Kadalūr made a grant for the *catra festival of lights* in the temple of Channakeśvara according to former custom.³ An inscription dated Śaka 1443 (A. D. 1521-22) informs us that Sadāśiva Nāyaka provided ghee for lamps during the festival of *Tirukkūratigai* to the temple of Bīhadambā at Devikkapuram for the merit of the chief (avāmi) Tirumalai Nāvaka.⁴ In Śaka 1444 (1522-23) the daughter of Kannadiya Chief Devappudaiyar Marudarśar-Padaividū gave a gift of ghee for the same festival to the same temple.⁵

The inscriptional evidence about donations given by certain individuals for the expense of festival of lights or mere lights⁶ in temples of specific gods and goddesses does not appear to refer to *Divālī* festival as such.⁷ Conti's description of *Divālī* at Vijayanagar is, is however, sufficient for our purpose.

¹ Śrī Kantaliyar, *IA*, XX, p. 430, Suryanarayan Rao, *The City*, p. 11. For an account of the *Dipāvālī* Festival, Wilson, *IA*, XXVI, p. 308, Gupta, *IA*, XXXII, pp. 237-239.

² Major India, p. 28, Sewall, *For Emp.*, p. 86.

³ *E. C. V.* p. 1, Hn 82, p. 25.

⁴ 361 of 1912, Rangachari, *Top List I. N. A.* 162 p. 49.

⁵ 362 of 1912, Rangachari, *ibid.*, N. A. 163, p. 50. Read Pietro della Valle's description.

⁶ On p. 115 of his *Purāṇa Records* (Dacca, 1940) Dr Hazra observes — "The inscriptional evidences show that the gifts of lamps to shrines became popular in Southern India about the end of the 9th century A. D." [*Ep. Ind.* III, 1894-95, pp. 281, 284, V, 42-44 and 104-106, VII (1902-03) 133 ff. and 138 ff. and so on. *JASB*, LXXII (1903) 120].

⁷ My friend M. M. Principal V. V. Mirashi writes to me on 23-7-1945

"As for *Divālī* The one description that I can just now recall occurs in an inscription found in *Chhattisgarh*. It is not dated but another inscription of the same reign is dated V. S. 1570 (= A. D. 1514). The inscription is not published but I have read the verse as follows —

(continued on the next page)

Students of the history of Indian art may be in a position to point out the representations of the *Devālī* festival in sculpture or painting. I may, however, record here one such representation of the *Jain Devālī*. It is found in the *Miniature Paintings*¹ of the *Jaina Kalpasūtra* executed in the Early Western Indian style) published by Norman Brown (Washington, 1934) p. 40, *Plate 25* Brown describes this painting as follows :—

" *Fig. 71* (Heeramanek Galleries, Newyork—MS of *Kalpasūtra* and *Kālakācāryakathā* with 87 miniatures, not dated—*Probably 16th Century*)—The *Festival of Lights*, KS, 128 (*Jacobi. Jaina Sūtras*, S B E, Vol 22, Oxford, 1884, p 266), On the night when Mahāvīra died the 18 confederated kings instituted an illumination on the *Posadhā* which was a fast day They said " *Since the light of holy knowledge is gone*, let us make a material illumination—Under a canopy are three males, probably typifying the 18 kings, holding *torches*. The scene bears the legend *दीवाली* (festival of lights) and Jacobi (J tr. 266n) says that the Jainas celebrate the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra with a festival of lights on the *New-Moon* of the month of *Kārttika* "

Some description of the *Devālī* as celebrated in the Deccan at *Kolhapur* in the *11th century* is found in the *story of King of Kollāpura* recorded by Merutunga in his *Prabandha-Cintāmaṇi* (Trans. by C H Tawney, R A S. B., Calcutta, 1901) p 111 The author belonged to Vardhamānapura (*Vaḍhvān*) in Gujarat and

(continued from the previous page)

" वस्मयक् प्रतिकारिकम्पानिदिनं स्नात्वा द्वास्यादरा-

द्वादानंश्च नत. शृणोति माहृत पुण्य पुराणादिकम् ।

दीवानामपि लक्ष्मणयकलप्राप्त्यै प्रयच्छत्यम् ।

दुर्गाया निकटे महानयमतः श्री बाहुरक्षमार्पितः ॥ "

I am thankful to Prin Mirashi for this valuable inscriptional reference

¹ I had inquired of Dr. H Goetz, Curator, Baroda Museum, if he could point out to me any paintings representing *Devālī* illuminations In reply Dr. Goetz informs me in his letter of 19-12-45 —

" As to *Devālī* illustrations, I can only say that there are many Mughal miniatures in the Baroda Museum showing illuminations by many small oil lamps, such as it is the practice at *Devālī* but I am not sure whether this is the only festival where this is done "

I take this opportunity of requesting other scholars to publish any information about the representations of *Devālī* either in painting or sculpture that may come to their notice.

composed this book of Narratives in *Samvat 1361* (= A. D. 1305). I note the following points from Merutunga's story referred to above:—

(1) Some bards were celebrating the glory of King Siddharāja of Gujarat (A. D. 1093-1143) at the court of the Kollāpur King, who doubted this glory and required some proofs for Siddharāja's skill in magic mentioned by the bards

(2) The above doubt of the Kollāpur King was reported to Siddharāja, who found an officer of his court ready to go to Kollāpur to prove Siddharāja's skill in magic. Siddharāja gave 3 lacs of rupees to this officer, who went to Kollāpur and stayed there for some days.

(3) "When the night of the *Diwālī* festival was near and the wives of the King of that city came to his palace in order to worship the goddess¹ *Mahālakṣmī*, that officer, having assumed the disguise of a magician, adorned with all those paraphernalia, and being accompanied by a certain Barbara who had carefully practised flying in the air, suddenly appeared on the pedestal of the goddess. He offered an oblation of gold, jewels and campher to the goddess and distributed to the King's wives betel similarly adorned and left there a *magic garment* marked with the name of King *Siddha*, pretending that it was a religious gift, and mounting on the back of Barbara flew up into the air and so returned as he came. When the night came to an end the King was informed by his wives of this act of the hostile monarch and being bewildered with fear he sent back that present to King *Siddha* by the hands of his ministers. Then that officer quickly hurried through the business of buying and selling his wares, and so on, and sent a message to his king by a swift runner, that he was not to grant an audience to those ministers until his arrival. After that he arrived there in a few days. The king, having been informed of the real state of the case took such steps to win over those ministers as occasion demanded."

Whatever be the truth of the above story it gives us a historical illustration of the association of magical performances with the

¹ Vide my paper on the *Iconography of Mahālakṣmī of Kolhapur* (*B.I.S. Mandal Quarterly*, Poona, Vol. XXIII, 1942, pp 17-25).

Divālī night, so graphically described by Mrs. Stevenson in the extract already reproduced by me. The *Śīlāhara* kings were ruling at Kolhapur at the time of king Siddharāja of Gujarat (A. D. 1093-1143). The goddess *Mahālakṣmī* was their tutelary deity and they called themselves " श्रीमहालक्ष्मीदेवीलक्ष्म्यवरप्रसाद " in their inscriptions. The *Sarasvatīpurāṇa* mentions that Siddharāja installed the images of *Mahālakṣmī* on the bank of the *Salasrahingū* lake constructed by him as I have shown in my paper on *Mahālakṣmī* (*B. I. S. Mandal Quarterly*, 1912)

From Merutunga's reference to *Divālī* at Kolhapur in his work of A. D. 1301 we go to the Marathi work *Jñāneśvārī* completed in A. D. 1290 by the great Saint of Mahārāstra, *Śrī Jñāneśvara*. In this work *Divālī* is referred to as follows (see *Jñāneśvārī* ed. by B. A. Bhide, Bombay, 1928) —

Page 106-107 — मा अविवेकाची काजळी ।
फडूनि विवेकदीप उजळी ।
ते योगियां पाहें दिवाळी । निरंतर ॥ ५४ ॥ "

Page 183 — " सूर्ये अविष्टिली प्राची ।
जमा राणीव दे प्रकाशाची ।
तेशी वाचा भोतयां ज्ञानाची । दिवाळी करी ॥ १२ ॥ "

Though used in metaphors by *Śrī Jñāneśvara* the above usages of word *दिवाळी* vividly bring to our mind the illuminations of the *Divālī* festival as current in the Mahārāstra in the 13th century.

To supplement the above reference to *Divālī* by *Jñāneśvara* we have a very elaborate description of the celebration of the *Divālī* festival in the *Mahānubhāva* text in Marathi (composed about A. D. 1250 called *Liṅg-Caritra* (ed. by H. N. Nene) Nagpur, Part III *Pūrvārḍhu*, Khanda 2, 1937) pp 116 ff. As the passage is too long for reproduction I note some points from it below. —

(1) This is a description of *Divālī* not in an aristocratic circle, but by *Cakradhara*,¹ the founder of the *Mahānubhāva* sect and his *Gosāvī* pupils.

(2) This *Divālī* was observed at *दिवरळी* (*जालना*).

¹ Vide pp 350-354 of मध्यमीन चरित्रकोश by S. Chitray, Poona, 1937. The dates for Cakradhara as given here are " A. D. 1191-1373 ". Cakradhara founded the Mahānubhāva Sect in Śaka 1190 (= 1268 A. D.) at *Paṭṭhap*, after having embraced *Sanyāsa*.

(2) महादाई, the woman—disciple of Cakradhara, managed all the work connected with this *Duvāli*.

(4) On the evening of the earlier day she stored sufficient water for bath of the entire party of the *Gosāvis*, who bathed next morning, getting up at dawn for this purpose. Plenty of oil was used for rubbing the bodies before this bath by the *Gosāvis* and other devotees of Cakradhara.

(5) After bath महादाई waved lights in a tray in front of these *Gosāvis* and others (*बोवाळणी जाली*) who then took betel, and *pān* (*तावाळ*) Dinner was given to the party by महादाई, who was helped by another lady उमाई in this work.

(6) भाऊबीज was observed on the following day when महादाई acted as sister to all the *Gosāvis*. She prepared nice dishes for their dinner such as मोदक, आहत, लाडू, सेव etc.

The *Bhāu-bīja* day observed by the *Gosāvis* is observed even to-day. It falls on *Kārttika Śuddha 2* (*dvitīyā*) i. e. on the day following the *Duvāli*. This festival is concerned with sisters who feast their brothers on this day. It is called *Yama-dvitiyā* in Sankarī and Hemādri (A. D. 1260) the contemporary of *Cakradhara* describes it in detail in his compendium called the *Caturtarya-Catāmama*.¹ This description is contained in an

¹ Ed. in Bib. Indica, Calcutta, 1878—See *Vrata Khanda* Chap. VI, pp. 384-386.—The extract about यमद्वितीया व्रत from the *Bhaviṣṣyottara* reads as follows —

“ कालिके शुक्लपक्षस्य द्वितीयायां युधिष्ठिर ।
यमो यमुनया पर्व भाजितः स्वग्रहे सदा ॥
द्वितीयायां महोत्सवं नारकीयाश्च तर्पिताः ।
पापेभ्योऽपि विमुक्तास्ते मुक्ताः सर्वनिबन्धनात् ॥
अशिताश्चातिमंतुषाः स्थिताः सर्वं वदच्छ्रया ।
तेषां महोत्सवो वृत्तः यमराट्सुखावहः ।
अतो यमद्वितीया सा प्रोक्ता लोके युधिष्ठिर ।
अस्यां निजग्रहे पार्थ न भोक्तव्यमतो बुधेः ॥
लोहेन भगिनी हस्ताङ्गोक्तव्य पुष्टिर्जनम् ।
दानानि च प्रदेयानि भगिनीभ्यो विधानतः ॥
स्वर्णालंकावस्त्राणि पूजासंस्कारभोजनैः । ”

In Rgvedi's book on *Āryan Festivals* already referred to by me the यमद्वितीया or भाऊबीज is described on pp. 297-298. He merely states that the story of यम and his sister यमुना is mentioned in the *Purāṇas* but does not give any exact reference to it.

extract from the *Bhavisyottara Purāṇa* quoted by Hemādri. The practices prescribed in the extract are current at present in Mahārāstra.

In a *Kannada* Inscription¹ of A. D. 1119 (11th May) of the reign of Cālukya Tribhuvanamalla there is a reference to *Dīpāvalī* day. (One) "Kāvarāja made a gift of one *gadyāna* out of the two *gadyānas* which the Mahājānas used to pay him, as a present on every *Dīpāvalī* day for the service of *Nileśvaradeva*".

I have already recorded references to *Divālī* from two Marathi sources viz. the *Jñāneśvari* (A. D. 1290) and the *Līlācaritra* (C. A. D. 1250). I shall record another reference to *Divālī* in an astronomical work called the *Jyotiśaratnamūlā*² by Śrīpati, which was composed about Śaka 981 (A. D. 1039) according to its editor the Mahārāstra historian, Visvanātha Kāshinātha Rajawade, who thinks that both the Sanskrit text and its Marathi commentary are the work of Śrīpati himself. The word *दिवाली* occurs in the Marathi commentary on a Sanskrit stanza as will be seen from the following stanza.—

Page 95— "माघे पंचदशि कृष्णा नभस्ये च त्रयोदशी ।

तृतीया माघवे शुक्ला नवम्युर्जे युगादयः ॥ १३ ॥ "

The commentary on this stanza reads as follows:—

"माघमासिन्धी अमावास्या शिरात्रि भाद्रपदमासश्चा कृष्णपक्षि त्रयोदशु अर्धपक्षि वैशाखमासि शुक्ला तृतीया : अक्षतृतीया : कार्तिक शुक्ल नवमी दिवाळि वितर्या : या तिथि ४ युगादि म्हाणिज ॥ "

At present the *Divālī* day is the 1st day of Kārttika Śukla pakṣa, while according to Śrīpati (about A. D. 1030) it appears

¹ Vide *Kannada Inscriptions from the Madras Presidency* (South Indian Inscriptions Texts, Vol. IX, Part I) ed. by Shameshastra and Lakshminārāyaṇa Rao, 1939, Page 195—Inscription No 198

See also *Epi. Ind.* VIII, p. 337 — Yewur inscription of A. D. 1179 of the time of Sankamadeva. The date recorded gives (1) *Viśākṛin* year, (3) New Moon day of *Āśvayuja*, (3) *Somavāra*, and (4) महापर्व (allusion is apparently to *Dīpāvalī* according to Dr. Fleet (Vide p. 257 of *Kadambakula* by Prof. Moraes—*Dīpāvalī* extended from अश्विन कृष्ण १४ to कार्तिक शु. १.))

² Vide भारत इतिहास संशोधक मंडळ ग्रन्थमाला (No 8)—द्वितीय संमेलनवृत्त (शक १८३६—1914, Poona)—श्रीपतीरुत मराठी ज्योतिषरत्नमाला (शक १६१ सुमार) p. 95

to have been celebrated before "कार्तिक शुद्ध नवमी". I request the students of Indian Astronomy to throw some light on this question from the texts on Indian Astronomy.

In the Marathi poem by the Mahānubhāva poet Narendrakavi, called the रुक्मिणी-स्वयंवर¹ composed in Śaka 1213 (A. D. 1292) we find the following references to the *Divālī* —

Page 90— Description of *Dvārakā*

“ कीं आनंद-दिवाळियेचें तेजः ।
की आकाशीं ज्योतिचें जाळ हों काज ।
की गगनासि वाइलें भोजः यादव-प्रतापाचें ” ७१२

Page 94— Description of Vasanta (spring-time)

“ कीं तें संभोग-सुखाची दिवाळीः ।
विरहिणी घंढेवाळीया हाति काजळी
जित-इंद्रियें हारवीति तिये वेळींः जूं बेराग्याचें ” ७३८

Prof. Kolate has explained the metaphor in this stanza pertaining to the *Divālī* referred to by the poet in his notes at the end of the volume. He explains the word घंढेवाळी as कोलीत or मशाल on page 141 while on page 230 घंढेवाळी is explained as lamps lighted during the *Dvālī* festival on the top of a big heap of grass.²

While explaining the above reference to दिवाळी Prof. Kolate has drawn our attention to the following reference to दिवाळी in the *Jñāneśvari* —

Chap. VI (*Ovi* 389 - p 135 of Bhide's edition)

“ तेसैं होय तिये मेळीं । मग सामरस्याचिया राउळीं ।
महासुखाची दिवाळी । जगेसि दिसे ॥ ३८९ ॥ ”

We have already pointed out two references to दिवाळी in *Jñāneśvari*, to which the above one may now be added.

¹ Critically edited by Prof V. B. Kolate, King Edward College, Amraoti, (अरुण प्रकाशन, Malkapur, Berar) 1940.

² Ibid, p. 230—“ घंढेवाळी = दिवाळीच्या विवसांत गवताचा एक उंच भाग बांधतात आणि त्यावर दिवे लावतात ”

Before I proceed to note the references to *Divālī* in sources earlier than those referred to above I shall record its fairly detailed description in Sanskrit given in an encyclopaedic work called the *आकाशमेरुवकल्प* which appears to be a reflection of the social and religious practices of the Vijayanagar Empire (between say A. D. 1450 and 1550).¹ This is a description of a royal *Divālī* and hence stands in contrast with the *Divālī* celebrated by Cakradhara and his Gosāvis. This description reads as follows in the B. O. R. Institute MS No. 43 of 1925-26 of *आकाश-मेरुवकल्प* :-

Page 217 — 67th Patala describing नरकचतुर्दशी.

“ श्री शिवः— अथान्यद्वाश्विने मासि कर्तव्यं कर्म राजभिः ।
वक्ष्यामि सर्वपापघ्नमलक्ष्मीविनिवारकम् ॥ १ ॥
रूपसौभाग्यसन्तानसंपत्सारस्वतप्रदम् ।
साम्राज्यदं विजयदं विशेषेण सहीभुजाम् ॥ २ ॥
सर्वशत्रुक्षयकरं गंगास्नानफलप्रदम् ।
अश्विने मासि कृष्णायां चतुर्दश्यान्तपोत्तमः ॥ ३ ॥
बाह्ये मुहुर्त उत्थाय कृतशौचक्रियः शुचिः ।
प्रक्षाल्य पादावाचम्य दन्तधावनपूर्वकम् ॥ ४ ॥
पुरोहितान्पुरस्कृत्य सभार्यान् द्विजपुंगवान् ।
कांश्चिदाहूय संपूज्य तान् गंधकुसुमादिभिः ॥ ५ ॥
दत्त्वा तद्विजयैर्भ्यः तांबूलानि फलानि च ।
तेराशरिक्षतान् दत्तानादायांजलिना नृपः ॥ ६ ॥
धृत्वा शिरसि चाभ्यंगानिमित्तं तैलमुत्तमम् ।
दत्त्वा तद्विजयैर्भ्यो नत्वा कृत्वा प्रदक्षिणम् ॥ ७ ॥
पुनः प्रस्थाप्य तान् विप्रान् तत्परं पृथिवीपतिः ।
हेमपीठे समासीनः प्राक्मुखः प्रयतः शुचिः ॥ ८ ॥
नदत्सु पंचवायेषु बाह्यकक्षान्तरे ततः ।
कण्ठकंकणया वध्वा द्रवल्मादुरोजया ॥ ९ ॥

¹ Vide my paper in the *Karnatak Historical Review*, Vol. V (1938) Part I, pp. 7-18.

² The *Sukranīṣāra* (ed. Jivānanda Vidyāsūgar, Calcutta, 1882) chap. IV deals with लोकधर्मनिरूपण, in which the King is enjoined to build temples of several deities and arrange for their annual festivals.—

P. 372— “एवंविधान् नृपो राष्ट्रे देवान् संस्थापयेत् सदा ।

प्रतिसंवत्सरे तेषां उत्सवान् सम्यगाचरेत् ॥ २०२ ॥”

9 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

अभ्यक्तः स्नापितो महैः कैश्चिच्छोष्णैश्च वारिणा ।
 धृत्वा धीतांबरं दिव्यं स्वर्णतन्वञ्चिताञ्चलम् ॥ १० ॥
 इत्येवं मङ्गलं ज्ञानं कृत्वा प्रागुदयाद्रवे ।
 पश्चात् सूर्योदयादूर्ध्वं पुण्ड्रं धृत्वा महीपतिः ॥ ११ ॥
 कर्म तत्कालकर्तव्यं नित्यं निर्वर्त्य तत्परम् ।
 स्वेष्टदेवं समभ्यर्च्य गंधपुष्पैर्यथाविधि ॥ १२ ॥
 अलक्ष्मीपरिहारार्थं दत्त्वा दीपत्रयं नृपः ।
 मदाक्षिणं द्विजातिभ्यस्तेन नीराजितः पुनः ॥ १३ ॥
 सखद्वयसाशिरस्त्राणः सर्वाभरणभूषितः ।
 आस्थानकूटमासाद्य सर्वतस्समलंकृतम् ॥ १४ ॥
 सपुत्रपीत्रस्सामात्यः सभृत्यपरिचारकः ।
 सिंहासने समासीनः श्वेतछत्रेण चारुणा ॥ १५ ॥
 वधूविधूयमानाभ्यां चामराभ्यां विराजितः ।
 आस्थानवर्तिनां राज्ञां मन्त्रिणां च पुरोधसाम् ॥ १६ ॥
 सामन्तराजपुत्राणां विबुधानां विनोदिनाम् ।
 कवीनां गायकानां च योगिनां च नियोगिनाम् ॥ १७ ॥
 नटानां नर्तकानां च गणकानां हिमाद्रिजे ।
 तथैव गणिकानां च तत्तदुद्योगवर्तिनाम् ॥ १८ ॥
 शिरःकम्पेन केषांचित् केषांचित्क्वलोक्तैः ।
 मन्दस्मितेन केषांचित् केषांचित् वाग्विलासतः ॥ १९ ॥
 आलोकशब्दैः केषांचित् वेत्रपाणिसमीरितैः ।
 संभावयन् यथायोग्यमात्मदर्शनमद्रिजे ॥ २० ॥
 मुहूर्तमात्रमासीनस्तस्मिन् सिंहासने नृपः ।
 तत्परं तस्मास्तास्तारैरर्पितान्यंबराणि वै ॥ २१ ॥
 गन्धकुंकुमकस्तूरीतांबूलानि यथोचितम् ।
 दापयित्वासनात् तस्मादवरुह्याप्रयोः करौ ॥ २२ ॥
 अवलंब्य प्रविश्यान्तःपुरं स्त्रीरत्नसंकुलम् ।
 पुत्रपौत्रैः परिवृतः भुक्त्वान्नमृतोपमम् ॥ २३ ॥
 ततः स्वीकृत्य तांबूलं अवरोधजनैस्सह ।
 नीत्वा सरससहस्रैः तदहः शेषमद्रिजे ॥ २४ ॥
 ततः सेवार्थमागत्य बाह्यकक्षान्तरस्थितान् ।
 सामन्तराजपुत्रादीन् समाहूयाथ तैस्सह ॥ २५ ॥

निशामुक्ते बाणविद्या¹ हयानालोक्य तत्परम् ।
 विशालां प्राप्य नृपतिर्नाट्यशालां च तैस्तह ॥ २६ ॥
 नाट्यं नटीभिरारब्धं नानाभिनयमञ्जुलम् ।
 वीणामुरजनिस्तानमुरुषवाद्यनिनादितम् ॥ २७ ॥
 दृष्ट्वा प्रस्थाप्य तान् सर्वान् प्रविश्यान्तःपुरम्नृपः ।
 पुत्रपौत्रान्वितः श्रीमान् भुक्त्वा मधुरपूर्वकम् ॥ २८ ॥
 हंसतुलीविरचितशय्यायां शयितस्सुखम् ।
 कुर्वन् सरसल्लावायुसहिष्या सह पार्थिवः ॥ २९ ॥
 तदर्पितानि तांबूलीदलान्याकुचितानि च ।
 आददानस्तयासाकमानन्दानुभवी भवेत् ॥ ३० ॥
 इत्येवं देवि, नरकचतुर्दश्यां नृपोत्तमैः ।
 कर्तव्यं कर्म कथितं मया संग्रहतस्तव ॥ ३१ ॥

इत्याकाशभैरवाक्ये महाशैवतन्त्रे साम्राज्यपीठिकायां नरकचतुर्दशी-
 कर्तव्यमहोत्सवस्वरूपकथनं नाम सप्तषष्ठितमः पटलः । ”

Page 22— 68th Patala describing दीपावली—उत्सव

“ श्री शिवः—अथ तत्कार्तिके मासि दीपावल्यां मर्हाभुजा ।
 यत्कर्तव्यं पृथुश्रोणि वक्ष्यामि तव सांप्रतम् ॥ १ ॥
 कार्तिकस्य सिते पक्षे या तिथिः प्रतिपत् स्मृता ।
 दीपावलीति विज्ञेया सा सर्वा शुभदायिनी ॥ २ ॥
 तस्यां तिथौ नृपः प्रातरुत्थाय शयनाभिप्रे ।
 कृतशीचाक्रियस्सम्यक् कृत्वा वै दन्तधावनम् ॥ ३ ॥
 नित्यकर्म विनिर्वर्त्य तत्कालोचितमग्निं ।
 उपास्य भास्करं राजा ततस्संगम आगते ॥ ४ ॥
 पुरोहितं पुरस्कृत्य तदाशीभिर्विवर्धितः ।
 स्वेष्टदेवं हृदि ध्यायन् पीठे रत्नमये शुभे ॥ ५ ॥

¹ बाणविद्या means here display of Fire-works. Abdur Razak who stayed in Vijayanagar from April 1443 to 6th December 1443 mentions the use of pyrotechny or fire-works at the महानवमी festival (See Elliot. History of India, IV, pp. 117-118). The present reference to बाणविद्या at Diwali festival is important as it is one of the earliest references in Sanskrit sources referring to the use of fire-works at Hindu festivals. In the आकाशभैरवरूप there is a reference to gun on folio 189 as follows.—

“ त्रयोविंशं मालिकार्जं ”. Here मालिका means a gun. (See also my paper on Guns and Gun-powder in India in Sir E. Denison Ross Volume, pp. 117-124).

स्वासीनः प्राङ्मुखो देवि वायव्योपपुरस्सरम् ।
 अभ्यक्तो गन्धतेलेन स्नापितः कोष्णवारिणा ॥ ६ ॥
 धीतांबरधरः कालदेशे धृतबोर्ध्वपुण्ड्रकम् ।
 निर्वर्त्य नित्यकर्माथ तत् कालोचितमद्रिजं ॥ ७ ॥
 स्वेष्टदेवं समाराध्य गन्धपुष्पाक्षतादिभिः ।
 अलक्ष्मीपरिहारार्थं लक्ष्म्याश्च स्थैर्यसिद्धये ॥ ८ ॥
 लक्ष्मीनारायणप्रीत्यै दत्त्वा दीपत्रयं नृपः ।
 सदाक्षिणान्दिजातिभ्यस्तेन नीराजिनः पुनः ॥ ९ ॥
 सपुत्रपौत्रस्तामात्यः सर्वाभरणभूषितः ।
 आस्थानशालामासाय राज्ञामास्थानवर्तिनाम् ॥ १० ॥
 सर्वेषां दर्शनं दत्त्वा यथोचितमगात्मजे ।
 गन्धकस्तूरिकादीनि दत्त्वा भूमिपुरंदरः ॥ ११ ॥
 मुहूर्तमात्रमासीनां भूपतिः कनकासने ।
 तत्परं ताननृपवरान् प्रस्थाप्यान्तःपुरं नृपः ॥ १२ ॥
 प्रविश्य देवि साम्राज्यलक्ष्मीं संपूज्य सादरम् ।
 कान्ताजनन कर्पूरदीर्घनीराजितंऽद्रिजं ॥ १३ ॥
 भुक्त्वा मुहूर्तं सुप्त्वाऽथ सायंकाले समागतं ।
 मलयुद्धादिकं दृष्ट्वा तत्परं तु निशामुखे ॥ १४ ॥
 नगरे देवतामारेष्वालयेषु सभासु च ।
 चत्वरेषु तु रम्येषु गोपुराट्टालकेषु च ॥ १५ ॥
 हर्म्येषु चातिरम्येषु मीधेष्वत्युन्नतेषु च ।
 विशालासु वरारोहे चन्द्रशालासु सर्वतः ॥ १६ ॥
 भूपालास्थानकूटेषु कस्यासु विविधासु च ।
 नाट्यशालासु रम्यासु वीथीषु च विशेषतः ॥ १७ ॥
 विन्यस्य विविधान् दीपान् किंकरांस्तु कृतश्रमान् ।
 गन्धताम्बूलवस्त्रार्चैर्बहुमान्य महीपतिः ॥ १८ ॥
 तत्सर्वं दीपनिवहं श्रिये जातेति मन्त्रतः ।
 महालक्ष्म्यै नरपतिः समर्प्य तदनन्तरम् ॥ १९ ॥
 सिंहामुने स्वकीयानि भूषणानि निधाय च ।
 जलपूर्णं स्वर्णकूर्चं पल्लवाथिरलंकृतम् ॥ २० ॥
 तण्डुलोपरि विन्यस्य तत्रावाह्य बलिं प्रभुम् ।
 वक्ष्यमाणप्रकारेण ध्यायेद्वाजा महाबलिं ॥ २१ ॥

ध्यायेद्वर्लि महाकायं सर्वाभरणभूषितम् ।
तपसाहृत देवेन्द्र वैभवं विष्णुवल्लभम् ॥ २२ ॥
खड्ग चर्मधरं स्त्रर्णकान्तिकान्तसमन्वितम् ।
शुक्रायमान्यसहितं दैत्यदानवसेवितम् ॥ २३ ॥
एवं ध्यात्वाचर्येत्सम्यक् नाममन्त्रेण तं बलिम् ।
नतः पुष्पांजलिं दद्यात् वक्ष्यमाणेस्तु नामभिः ॥ २४ ॥
वलीन्द्रः प्रह्लादपौत्रो विरोचनसुतस्ततः ।
महोन्नमर्दनो दानवार्थीशो विष्णुभक्तकः ॥ २५ ॥
विभवप्रद इत्येतैर्दत्त्वा पुष्पांजलिं ततः ।
प्रार्थयेत्स्वाभिलषितं मन्त्रेणानेन पार्थिवः ॥ २६ ॥
यथा त्वं सर्वलोकानामधिपोऽस्य ह्यरेश्वर ।
तथा मे कुरु सौभाग्यं यावदाभूतसंप्लवम् ॥ २७ ॥
इति संप्रार्थ्य विप्रेभ्यो दद्याद्विनानुसारतः ।
सुवर्णं रजतं मुक्तामणींश्च विविधानपि ॥ २८ ॥
मित्रात्मबन्धुमुत्स्यंभ्यो दद्याद्धर्षसमन्वितः ।
कर्पूरशकलैस्मार्पं तांबूलानि विशेषतः ॥ २९ ॥
एव कृत्वा नरपतिर्दीपावल्युत्सवं प्रियं ।
सर्वदानैश्च यत्पुण्यं यत्पुण्यमखिलाध्वरैः ॥ ३० ॥
तत्पुण्यं समवाप्नोति नात्र कार्या विचारणा ।
एवं ते देवि कथितो दीपावल्योत्सवो महान् ॥ ३१ ॥
आयुरारोग्यविजयसंपत्सारस्वतप्रदः ।

इत्याकाशभैरवाख्ये महाशैवतन्त्रे साम्राज्यलक्ष्मीपीठिकायां दीपा-
वल्युत्सवस्वरूपकथनं नाममष्टषष्टितमः पटलः ॥

The two chapters reproduced above contain quite a colourful picture of the royal *Divāl* celebrated on two days viz. (1) आश्विन कृष्ण चतुर्दशी and (2) कार्तिक शुक्ल प्रतिपत् . This is *Divāl* as observed in the South of India between say A.D. 1400 and 1600. I now continue my story of *Divāl* and come to the extreme North of India and record a short description of *Divāl* given by a Muslim writer Abdul Rahamān in an *Apabhramṣu* poem called the *संदेशरासक* ¹

¹ Ed. by Jinaviṣayān and Bhayana, Bhāratīya Vidyābhavan, Bombay, 1945, page 71. In the *Preface* (p. 12) Muni Jinaviṣayaji infers that *संदेशरासक* "must have been composed during the reign of Siddharāja or Kumārāpāla I. a. in the latter half of the 12th century or at the latest the first half of the 12th century of the Vikrama era."

in which we find a description of the month of *Kārttika* and the *Dipāvālī* night (जोड़िखिहि) as follows :—

“ दितिय गिसि दीवालिय दीवय
णवससिरेहसरिस करि लीअय ।
मंडिय भुवण तरुण जोड़िखिहिं
महिणिय दिति सलाइय अखिहिं ॥ १७६ ॥ ”

Mr Bhayani observes on p. 90 of his critical Introduction :—

“ On the *Dipāvālī* night mansions were decorated with lights resembling the crescent moon. Ladies applied collyrium to their eyes (176) ”.

The commentary called टिप्पनक on the above passage reads as follows —

अथ कार्तिकवर्णनम्—“ नार्यः दीपान् नवशशिरस्त्रासदृशान् करे
गृहीत्वा निशि ददन्ति । तज्जोतिष्कैः दीपैः भुवनानि मण्डितानि ।
अन्यच्च नार्यः तेषां दीपानां कज्जलं शलाकया कृत्वा नेत्रेषु
ददन्ति ॥ १७६ ॥ ”

Illumination of houses on the *Divālī* night by Hindu ladies is aptly described by this Muslim writer who belonged to *Multān*¹ (मलत्याण) in the Punjab. He was well versed in *Sanskrit*, *Prakrit* and *Apabhramśa*. He must have mastered these languages at some seat of Hindu Culture (perhaps it was Multan).

From the above description of *Divālī* in the Punjab of C. A. D. 1150 we now go to Alberuni's description of *Divālī* of C. A. D. 1030. In Alberuni's remarks² “ on the Festivals and Festive days ” of the Hindus he describes the *Divālī* festival as follows :—

“ 1st *Kārtika* or new moon's day, when the sun marches in *Libra* is called *Divālī*. Then people bathe, dress festively, make presents to each other of betel leaves and areca nuts; they ride to the temples to give alms and play merrily with each other till noon. In the night they light a great number of lamps in every place so that the air is perfectly clear. The cause of this festival

¹ See p. 753 of *World Pictorial Gazetteer* by Hammerton — Multan stands on the river Chenab. It is about 190 miles S. W. of Lahore. Principal Buildings are two Mahomedan Shrines and the remains of an old Hindu temple. A great trading centre (shawls and carpets.)

² Vide p 182 of Vol II of *Alberuni's India*, ed. by E. C. Sachau, London, — Chap LXXVI

is that *Lakṣmī* the wife of *Vāsudeva* once a year on this day liberates *Bali*, the son of *Vīrocana*, who is a prisoner in the seventh earth. Therefore, the festival is called *Balirājya* i. e. the principality of *Bali*. The Hindus maintain that this time was a time for luck in *Kṛtāyuga* and they are happy because the feast day in question resembles that time in the *Kṛtāyuga*. "

In our search for the lights of the *Dvālī* we have traversed a period about 950 years and moved from the south of India to its extreme north. We stand on the threshold of antiquity at about 1000 A. D.¹ and try to see if we can cross this threshold and notice any lights of the *Dvālī* in the inner apartments of the Indian history.

About 90 years before Alberuni's description of the Hindu Diwali in North India we find a brilliant poetic description of *Dvālī* in the *Yasastilaka campū* of Somadevasūri composed in Śaka 881 (A. D. 959). About this description my friend Dr. V. Raghavan makes the following remarks in his *Gleanings from Somadevasūri's Yasastilaka-campū* " (p. 379 of *Journal of Ganga-nath Jha Research Institute*, May 1944 - Vol. I, part 3) :-

" Pp. 597-99 (*Kāvya-mālā* 70, Bombay, 1901) — The *Mahā-navami* festival is followed by the *Dipotsava*. Houses are white-washed and decorated with white festoons; music, merry-making and gambling go on; the tops of houses are bright with rows of lights. This festival is in the *Śavat* season. "

The text of the *Dvālī* description reads as follows :—

"—इति विजयजेत्रायुधमागधःवबोधितलक्ष्मीं महानवमीं² निर्वर्त्य ।

¹ In a Chinese poem on the *Lantern Festival* (of the first full Moon) by Au-yang Hsin (A. D. 1007-1078) we get a parallel of our *Dvālī* (Vide p. 394 of *T'ien Hsia Monthly*, (November, 1939). I quote a stanza from this poem :-

" Last year at the *Lantern Festival*

The flower-market lights were bright as day,
When the moon mounted to the tops of the willows,
Two lovers kept their tryst after the yellow dusk "

² The महानवमी festival was celebrated on a huge scale during the time of the Vijayanagar Empire. It is called नवरात्र at present. It begins on आश्विन शुक्ल प्रतिपद् and ends on आश्विन शुक्ल ९, followed by शुक्ल १० which is विजय-दशमी (दसरा), which is again followed by the *Dvālī* on कार्तिक शुक्ल प्रतिपद् (See p. 267-284 of आर्योच्चा सणाचा इतिहास by *Rgveda*).

तथा--

हंसावली द्विशुणकेतुसितांशुकर्त्रीः

पद्मावतंसरमणीरमणीयसारः ।

प्रासादसारितमुधाश्रुतिदिप्तदिको

दीपोत्सवस्तव तनोतु मुदं महीश ॥ ४६२ ॥

युतोन्मादितकामिनीजितधृतप्राणेशचाटूत्कटः

क्रीडाद्वारविलासिनीजनभवद्भूषाविकल्पोद्भटः ।

आतोषध्वनिमङ्गलारवभरव्याजृम्भिताशामुखः

प्रीतिं पूर्णं मनोरथस्य भवत. पुष्पात्प्रदीपोत्सवः ॥ ४६३ ॥

आभान्यखर्वशिखराप्रविटङ्कपालि-

दीपावली युतिधृतपुरसौधबन्धाः ।

प्रन्यङ्कसगतमहीपधिदीप्तदेहा-

स्त्वां सेवितुं कुलनगा इव दत्तयात्राः ॥ ४६४ ॥

इति सूनासूक्तसृचितावगरां दीपोत्सवश्रियं चानुभूय । etc. '

From the above description of *Divālī* by a Southern writer of C. A. D 950 we go to a Kashmirian text "not later than 6th or 7th century A. D." viz. the नीलमतपुराण¹ in which I find the following description of *Divālī* :—

Page 42 (Lahore Edition, 1924)—

तथा पक्षे व्यतीते तु कर्तव्या सुखसुनिष्ठा ॥ ५०५ ॥

पञ्चदश्यां यथा विप्र तथा मे मदतः शुणु ।

तस्यां दिवा न भोक्तव्यं बालानुरजनं विना ॥ ५०६ ॥

सूर्ये त्वस्तमनुप्राप्ते पूजयित्वा करीषिणीम् ।

दीपवृक्षास्ततो देयाः देवतायतनेषु च ॥ ५०७ ॥

चतुष्पथस्मशानेषु नदीपर्वतवेश्मसु ।

वृक्षमूलेषु मोष्ठेषु चत्वरेश्वापणेषु च ॥ ५०८ ॥

वस्त्रैश्चेवापणाः सर्वे कर्तव्याश्चोपशोभिताः ।

वीमालापरिक्षिप्ते प्रदेशे तदनन्तरम् ॥ ५०९ ॥

स्वलंकृतैश्च भोक्तव्यं द्विजेन्द्र नववाससा ।

सुहृद्भिर्बाह्यैः सार्धं बंधुमिश्रालुयायिभिः ॥ ५१० ॥

¹ Ed. by Ram Lal and Zaddoo, Lahore, 1924 — p. 7 of Introduction. — See also Winternitz *History of Indian Literature* (Calcutta, 1927) Vol. I, p. 583 — Kalhaṇa (about 1148 A. D) drew on this Purāṇa. He regarded it as a venerable Purāṇa. " It must be several centuries earlier than Kalhaṇa's work " (राजतरङ्गिणी).

ततः प्राप्ते द्वितीयेऽङ्गि स्वनुष्ठितैः स्वलंकृतैः ।
 क्रीडितव्यं तथा द्यूतैः श्रोतव्यं गीतवादिताम् ॥ ५११ ॥
 विशेषवच्च भोक्तव्यैः पूर्वोक्तैस्तैजनेस्सह ।
 तस्मिन् द्यूते जयो यस्य तस्य संवत्सरः शुभः ॥ ५१२ ॥
 तस्यां रात्रौ तु कर्तव्यं शय्यास्थानं सुशोभितः ।
 गन्धर्वक्षेत्रथा धूपैः रत्नेश्चैवाभिलंकृतम् ॥ ५१३ ॥
 दीपमालापरिक्षिप्तं तथा धूपेन घृषितम् ।
 दयिताभिश्च सहितैः तेनैवा सा निशा भवेत् ॥ ५१४ ॥
 पूज्या नूतनवासोभिः सुहृत्संबन्धिबांधवाः ।
 ब्राह्मणा क्षत्र्यवर्गाश्च चन्द्रदेव यथाविधि ॥ ५१५ ॥
 इति नी० कार्तिकामास्यां दीपमालावर्णनम् ।”

The above passage corresponds to verses 398 to 407 in the Critical Edition of the *Nilamata* by K. S. J. M. de Vreede published by E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1936 (pp. 36-37).

From the description of *Dipamālā* in the *Nilamata Purāṇa* of Kashmir composed in the “6th or 7th century A. D.” we turn to the play *Nāgānanda*¹ of Śrī Harsa, who is supposed to be identical with Harsavardhana of Kanauj, the reputed author of two other plays viz. *Ratnāvalī* and *Priyadarśikā*, who ruled between A. D. 606 and 618. In Act IV of *Nāgānanda* I find a reference² to *Divālī* in the following extract :—

“प्रतिहार—अहमपि महाराजविश्वावसुना समादिष्टः । यथा सुनन्द
 गच्छ मित्रावमुं ब्रूहि । अस्मिन् दीपप्रतिपदुत्सवे मलय-
 वत्या जामातुश्चेतदुत्सवानुरूपं यत्किञ्चित् प्रदीयते । तदा-
 गत्य निरूप्यताम् इति । तद्गच्छतु राजपुत्रीसकाशमार्गः ।
 अहमपि युवराजमित्रावसोरानयनाय गच्छामि ।

(इति निष्क्रान्ती)

In their notes³ on the expression “दीपप्रतिपदुत्सवे” the editors observe. “This seems to be a festival held on the first day of

¹ Ed. by G. B. Brahme and S. M. Paranjpe.

² Ibid, pp. 61-62.

³ Ibid Notes, p. 51.

the bright fortnight of *Kārtika*¹ and celebrated with illuminations, our *Divālī*." I think the cumulative effect of the history of *Divālī* reconstructed by me so far will warrant the above identification of दीपप्रतिपदुत्सव with our *Divālī* festival.

All modern annotators and editors² of the *Nāgūnanda* equate "दीपप्रतिपदुत्सव" with *Divālī* festival but the commentary³ of Śivārāma explains the expression with the remarks: प्रतिपदुत्सवे स्थालीपाकारये. I cannot say if the *Divālī* was known as स्थालीपाक-उत्सव in ancient or mediaeval India. In this connection I note here some points about the origin of the *Divālī* festival recorded by "Rgvedi" in his book on *Aryan Festivals*⁴ already referred to by me. These points are briefly as follows:-

(1) The present दीपावली महोत्सव is a unification and transformation of three पाकयज्ञs v.z. (i) पार्वण, (ii) आश्वयुजी and (iii) आश्रयण.

(2) पार्वण appears to have been observed on आश्विन वद्य ३० in ancient times as a पाकयज्ञ in honour of the ancestors.

(3) आश्वयुजी was observed in ancient times on the आश्विन पौर्णिमा. It pertained to agriculture, the presiding deity of which was सीता.

(4) आश्रयण (नवाक्षोष्टि) was observed on मार्गशीर्ष पौर्णिमा. It indicated the closing of the सैवन्तर.

(5) In course of time कार्तिक was fixed upon as the first month of the विक्रम संवत् during the reign of विक्रमादित्य, the founder of this

¹ Mr. R. N. Mehta in his *Pre-Buddhist India* (Bombay, 1939, pp 354-355) deals with sports and festivals. In this connection he refers to (2) कार्तिक festival on the night of the Full Moon (कार्तिकी पूर्णिमा) (2) आश्विन - night of Full Moon (चातुर्मासिनी कौमुदी). There is no reference in Mehta's description of these festivals to any display of lamps. (See J. L., pp 499-500-G. 143, II, p 372, V, pp 212-214, and J. VI, pp. 221-222, G 947, 949, 953 (उत्तमो उत्सवो)).

² Krishnashastry Chiplunkar in his Marathi translation of *Nāgūnanda* (Bombay, 1865) p 105, translates the expression "दीपप्रतिपदुत्सवे" as "दिवाळीचे सजाचे दिवशी" — Principal R. D. Karmarkar in his Edition of *Nāgūnanda* (Poona, 1919) p 50 of Notes, observes — "In the introductory scene from the conversation of the कञ्चुकी and प्रतीहार we learn that red garments have to be presented for ten days after marriage according to the custom of the time to the bride and the bride-groom and also that विशावहू wants to make a suitable present to the newly wedded pair at the approaching *Dīpāvalī* festival".

³ Ed by T. Ganapati Śāstri, *Trivandrum S Series*, 1917, page 187.

⁴ आर्यविद्या सणांचा इतिहास, Bombay, 1916, pages 290-293.

era. The custom of celebrating the *Divālī* in this month in association with the other festivities of the New year's beginning must have given the *Divālī* its present form.

The above hypothesis about the origin and development of the modern *Divālī* festival needs to be substantiated by evidence. Its author has not recorded any convincing evidence in its support to compel our acceptance of it.

Our story of *Divālī* as revealed by datable literary evidence has so far come to C. A. D. 600. If the दीपप्रतिपदुत्सव mentioned in the *Nāgānandā* definitely means the *Divālī*¹ we can easily take its antiquity at least upto A. D. 500, as national festivals have always a long tradition behind them.

To go backwards from A. D. 500 is now a difficult task and I earnestly invite brother-scholars to point out from early sources any references to or descriptions of the *Divālī* which can establish the antiquity of this national festival at least for 2000 years, if not more.

Hemacandra in his *Deśināmamālā*² (III, 43) mentions a *Deśi* word "जक्खरत्ती" (= पक्षरात्रि) and equates it with दीवाली or दीपालिका. If this explanation is correct we can easily take back the antiquity of *Divālī* to the time³ of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, which mentions पक्षरात्रि in its list of festivals, as pointed out by Mr. T. N. Ray in his delightful article on "The Indoor and out-door Games of Ancient India" (Vide p 244 of *Proceedings of*

¹ My friend Mr M Govind Pai of Manjeshvar (South Kanara) states in a private communication that प्रतिपत् in "दीपप्रतिपदुत्सवे" clearly refers to कार्तिक शुक्ल प्रतिपत् because of the reference to शरत्समय in the following lines which are introduced by the poet in the same context— नायकः— मिश्रावसो पश्य पश्य शरत्समय-पाण्डुरमि पयोदपटले प्रावृत्ता मल्लिकाचलशिखरभियमुद्रहन्ति एते मलयाचल-सानवः " [These peaks of the मलय mountain, spread over by the veils of clouds, white on account of autumn, possess the beauty of the peaks of the *Himālaya* (मल्लिकाचल)].

² Ed. by Ramānujaśvāmī in *B. S. Series* (B. O. R. Institute, Poona, 1938) p. 148.

Example:— मणिबलरहि कुणन्ती जवाळेअम्मि जक्खरत्ति व ।

जणोहमाण वि तुमं नि सि जळदेण कि डरसि ॥ ३५ ॥

³ About 100 A. D.—Keith assigns the *Kāmasūtra* to C. 500 A. D. Mr. Ray accepts the date "beginning of the Christian era" for the work.

the Indian History Congress, Calcutta, 1939). Mr. Ray states that the festivals यक्षरात्रि, कौमुदीजागर and सुषसन्तक are termed माहिमनी or having got a noble purpose and are universal and the rest are देव्य or provincial. About यक्षरात्रि Mr Ray¹ observes —

"Yakṣarātri is performed during the night of the New Moon Night of Kārttika [Some are of opinion that यक्षरात्रि is the Full Moon Night of Kārttika But I don't think that they are correct Vide the commentary by Ramacandra Sāstri on *Kandarpacūḍāmaṇi* (I, 4. 42)] This night is also called सुषरात्रि.² People generally gamble during this night. This is the night when the *Dvāli* festival is celebrated nowadays almost every where in India. In Bengal and in some parts of India goddess *Kālī* is worshipped during the night. The New Moon and Full Moon Nights are specially fixed for the worship of *Kālī* and *Lakṣmī*, the goddess of wealth. The *Dvāli* festival is performed in honour of this goddess in most parts of India. The day following this night is called वृत्तप्रतिपत् which is the first day of the Indian calender of the Vikrama era. Yakṣarātri is the last night of the year. It is said that Bali, the king of the nether world ascended the throne on this day."

Hemacandra's equation: "अक्षरती (यक्षरात्रि) = दीवाली or दीवालीका" is a good starting point to hunt up the history of the *Dvāli* in sources on either side of the Christian era, especially because the *Kāmasūtra* mentions the यक्षरात्रि among three major festivals (माहिमन्य explained by Yaśodhara as "महिमा महत्त्वं तद्विद्यते यासात्"). If more evidence can be gathered about the यक्षरात्रि festival, we shall be in a position to clarify the problem of the origin of *Dvāli*

¹ Mr Ray states in foot-note 16 of his article — I have dealt with festivals in my Presidential address on the occasion of *Dipālī Utsab* (1346 B S) at Dinajpur, which is going to be published very soon." I have not seen this address.

² The commentator Yaśodhara in his *Jyāmangalā* commen. on the *Kāmasūtra* observes (p 55 of *Kāmasūtra*, ed. by Kedārūath, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1900) —

"यक्षरात्रिरिति । सुषरात्रिः । यक्षाणां नव सन्निधानम् । तत्र प्रायशः लोकस्य वृत्तकीडा । एता माहिमान्यः स्त्रीडाः । देश्या आह—
सहकारभञ्जिका" etc.

At the beginning of his article on Games referred to above Mr Ray observes. —

" It is not possible to give a chronological account of these games. There are certain games still prevalent in India, which can be traced as far back as the *Buddhist*, *Epic*, and even the *Vedic* period. So we shall arrange the games according to their nature and shall try to give their history as far as practicable ".

I am firmly convinced that without a chronological account of our festivals we cannot understand their history. In the present paper I have planted some mile-stones of the *chronology of Divālī* from about A. D. 100 to A. D. 1945 as will be seen from the following tabular statement. —

Chronology	Reference D = Divālī	Time indicated
Between A. D. 50 and 400	कामसूत्र mentions यक्षरात्रि as an important festival — According to Hemacandra जयसूक्त (यक्षरात्रि) is equal to दीवाली or दीपालिका — यक्षोपर (on कामसूत्र) explains यक्षरात्रि as सुखरात्रि, attended with यक्ष and वृत्तक्रिया. He calls it a माहिमनी festival as opposed to देश्य. Both these terms are mentioned by the कामसूत्र	The कामसूत्र gives its list of festivals as यक्षरात्रि, कौस्तुभजागर, सुखसन्तक etc. Is any chronological order intended in this list?
A. D. 606-648	Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj refers to दीपप्रतिपदस्य in his play नागानन्द which is equal to modern D as it has a reference to शरत्समय mentioned in the same context — The custom of presenting garments to the bride and bridegroom at this festival referred to in नागानन्द has its parallel in the modern custom of honouring the Son-in-law with feast and presents on the first D after marriage.	प्रतिपद of शरत्समय.

Chronology	Reference D = Divālī	Time indicated
Between A. D. 500 and 800	नीलमतपुराण composed in Kashmir describes in detail the दीपमाला festival with the following features — (1) All-round illuminations, (2) hoisting up of festoons, (3) Feasting with Brahmins, relatives and dependents, (4) Gambling, Music, (5) Passing the night in the company of ladies, (6) Wearing of rich apparel and jewels, (7) Presenting new garments to friends, relatives, Brahmins and the servants	पञ्चदशी —“कार्तिक अमाया दीपमाला वर्णनम्” according to colo- phon.
A. D. 959	सोमदेवसूत्रि in his महास्तिलकचतुर् composed during the reign of the राष्ट्रकुट King रुष्ण (III) of मान्यवंत (Malkhed) describes दीपोत्सव with the following features — (1) Houses, white-washed and decorated with white festoons, (2) Merry-making in the company of ladies, (3) Music, (4) Gambling, (5) Tops of houses bright with rows of lights, (5) Indicated by सुनासूक्त (“सुनासूक्त-सुवितावसरा दीपोत्सवश्चिद्यं”)	Performed after the महानवमी festival (महानवमी निर्वर्त्य).
A. D. 1030	The astronomer श्रीपति refers to दिवाळी in his Marathi commentary on his own ज्योतिषरत्नमाला.	Prior to कार्तिक शुक्रनवमी.
A. D. 1030	Alberuni in his “Enquiry into India” (Tahkik-i-Hind) gives a detailed description of D with the following features :- (1) name “Dibālī”, (2) Festive dress, (3) making presents of betel leaves and areca nuts, (4) Merry-	“1st Kārtika or New Moon's day when the Sun marches in Libra”.

Chronology	Reference D = Divali	Time indicated
	making, (5) visiting temples and giving alms, (6) All-round display of lamps at night, (7) cause of <i>D</i> given as the Liberation of <i>Bali</i> on this day by <i>Laksmi</i> , wife of <i>Vasudeva</i> , (8) a time for luck— <i>Alberūni</i> entered India in the train of Mahmūd of Gaznī.	
A. D. 1088-1172	हेमचन्द्र of Gujarāt refers in his <i>दशनाममाला</i> to "अक्षरती" (यक्षरात्रि) and equates it with दीवाली or दीपालिका	
Before A. D. 1159	त्रिकाण्डशेष of पुरुषोत्तमदेव mentions यक्षरात्रि=दीपाली (1. 1. 108) (see यक्षरात्रि in St. Petersburg Sans. Worterbuch)	
A. D. 1100-1200	Abdul Rahman of Multan in the Punjab in his <i>Apabhramsa</i> work <i>संदहरासक</i> describes the <i>Dipāvalī</i> night (जोड़किवहि) with the following features— (1) Illumination of mansions by ladies all-round. (2) Ladies applying the collyrium of these lamps to their eyes. (3) Resemblance of the Divali-lamps to the crescent moon	शरत् Season— कार्तिक वर्षेन.
A. D. 1119	A <i>Kannada</i> inscription of the Madras Presidency of the reign of Calukya Tribhuvanamalla refers to a gift of one <i>gadyāna</i> for the service of नीलेश्वर देव by one Kavarāja on a महापर्व, New Moon day of अश्वयुज, सोमवार.	New Moon day of अश्वयुज, सोमवार called महापर्व, which Dr. Fleet regards as दीपावलि (which extended from अश्विन कृष्ण १४ to कार्तिक शुक्ल १).

Chronology	Reference D = Divālī	Time indicated
A. D. 1290	<p>The Mahārāṣṭra Saint ज्ञानेश्वर refers to दिवाळी in his ज्ञानेश्वरी in three different metaphors—The illuminations of the Divālī are compared to the light of spiritual knowledge.</p>	
C. A. D. 1250	<p>In the Marathi Mahānubhāva text लीळाचरित्र a long description is given about the celebration of <i>Divālī</i> by चक्रधर, the founder of this sect and his Gosāvi pupils. Features of this description are :—</p> <p>(1) Plenty of water stored and used for the Divālī bath, taken by the <i>Gosāvis</i>.</p> <p>(2) Use of oil for rubbing the bodies before this bath.</p> <p>(3) Waving of lights (बोवाळणी) before the Gosāvis by the woman-disciple of चक्रधर.</p> <p>(4) Preparation of choice dishes for dinner such as मोदक, लाडू, नेव etc. on the बाळवीज (यम द्वितीया) day following the Divālī day.</p> <p>This was a Saint's <i>Divālī</i> without any merry-making of the aristocratic variety. It was quite modest and simple.</p>	
C. A. D. 1260	<p>इमार्जि in his चतुर्वर्गचिन्तामणि (वत खण्ड) describes the यमद्वितीया (or बाळवीज) festival. In this connection he quotes a passage from भविष्योत्तर containing the story of यम and his sister यमुना, who feasted him at her house. Since that time this festival was observed by brothers and sisters.</p>	<p>कार्तिक शुद्ध द्वितीया.</p>

Chronology	Reference D = Divāli	Time indicated
A. D. 1305	<p>मेरुतुङ्ग of Gujarat in his प्रबन्ध-वितामणि narrates the story of Kolhāpur king who was contemporary of king Siddharāja of Gujarat (A D 1093-1143). In this connection he refers to the Devāli festival at Kolhapur with the following features :-</p> <p>(1) Worship of the महालक्ष्मी goddess of Kolhapur by the king's wives on the Devāli night</p> <p>(2) Oblation of gold jewels and camphor offered to महालक्ष्मी on the Divāli night by an officer of Siddharāja.</p> <p>(3) Gift of a magic garment to महालक्ष्मी by the above officer.</p>	Devāli night.
A. D 1420	<p>Niccolo Conti, the Italian traveller who visited Vijayanagar about A. D. 1420 or 1421 has described the festivals that were celebrated at Vijayanagar such as वर्षप्रतिपदा, महानवमी, दीपावली and होली (Vide p. 252 of विजयनगर स्मारक ग्रन्थ, B I S. Mandal, Poona, 1936-37, article on विजयनगर आणि परकीय प्रवासी by R. M. Atlavale). He describes the Devāli lamps kept burning day and night within temples and on their roofs</p>	
Between A. D 1450 and 1600	<p>The आकाशमेरुचकल्प, an encyclopaedic work dealing with social religious and political life, possibly of Vijayanagar Empire describes in two chapters how a king should observe the Divāli</p>	<p>अश्विन कृष्ण चतुर्दशी or नरक चतुर्दशी and कार्तिक शिवे पक्षे प्रतिपदा.</p>

Chronology	Reference D = Divali	Time indicated
------------	-------------------------	----------------

on नरकचतुर्दशी and कार्तिक शुक्ल प्रतिपत्. The features of the नरकचतुर्दशी महोत्सव are :-

(1) This festival brings victory, progeny, happiness, prosperity etc to kings. It is called साम्राज्यद (giver of Sovereignty)

(2) Early morning bath, (3) Worship of *Purohitas* and other eminent Brahmins.

(4) At the bath the king's wife should anoint him with oil and *mallas* (wrestlers) should bathe him with warm water. This is called मङ्गलस्नान

(5) King should worship his special deity and light three lamps before it

(6) Then he should go to the *सामानकूट* (assembly hall) duly attired with sword, helmet, ornaments etc. and sit on the royal throne (*सिंहासन*) with all his servants and officers in attendance. He should receive here the members of the assembly consisting of tributary princes, learned Brahmins, poets, singers, actors, dancers, astrologers, and courtezans. This reception should be according to the status of each class of the assembly. The King should then distribute presents in the form of garments. The distribution of *tāmbūla* etc should bring the function to a close.

Chronology	Reference D = Divālī	Time indicated
	(7) The King should then go to the अन्तःपुर and there in the company of beautiful ladies, his sons and grand-sons etc. finish his dinner	
	(8) In the evening he should witness, in the company of tributary princes etc. a display of बाणबिद्या (fire-works) followed by a dramatic performance in the नाट्यशाला accompanied with singing etc.	
	(9) He should then retire to the अन्तःपुर, take his meals with the members of the house-hold and later pass the night in the company of his chief queen (महिषी)	
	The features of the दीवाली proper on the following day (कार्तिक शुद्ध प्रतिपद्) are :—	
	(1) Bath etc. as on the previous day.	
	(2) Worship of आस्कर (Sun),	
	(3) offering three lamps to लक्ष्मीनारायण for averting अलक्ष्मी and establishing लक्ष्मी on a secure basis (स्वयंसेवये).	
	(3) Holding a gathering in the आस्थानकुट as on the previous day.	
	(4) Retiring to अन्तःपुर and there worshipping साम्राज्यलक्ष्मी.	
	(5) After-noon rest, followed by entertainments like मङ्गयुद्ध.	
	(6) Illuminations all-round in the capital in temples, assem-	

Chronology	Reference D = Divālī	Time indicated
	bly-halls, terraces, streets and squares, theatres etc.	
	(7) Honouring the royal servants with <i>tāmbūla</i> and garments after their labours (कृतबमान्) for the success of the Divālī celebrations.	
	(8) Dedication of the entire illuminations (दीपनिबद्ध) to महालक्ष्मी	
	(9) Worship of चली, son of विरोचन and grandson of प्रह्लाद.	
	(10) Distribution of gifts of gold etc. to Brahmins, relatives etc with a joyous heart.	
	Thus terminates the दीपावली-उत्सव contributing to long life, health, victory, prosperity and knowledge.	
A. D. 1590	<i>Ann-i-Albari</i> of Abul Fazl describes <i>Divālī</i> .	<i>Kārttika</i> कृतपक्ष १५ and शुक्लपक्ष १३.
	<i>Features</i> - (1) Greatest festival of the Vaisya caste, (2) Illuminations—difference in calculating the date of D—celebrated on कार्तिक शुक्ल १३ and कृष्ण १५, (3) Lamps are lit as on the Muslim festival <i>Shab-i-barāt</i> , (4) Dicing and other strange traditions.	
A.D. 1613, 1623, 1651, 1671, 1673, 1690, 1820, 1843 1883.	European references to <i>Divālī</i> recorded in Hobson - Jobson <i>Features</i> - (1) Feasting, (2) Festival in honour of विष्णु, (3) Sending presents to all concerned, (4) Banias' Divālī, (5) Grand festival season, (6) Fireworks (1820), (7) Worship of लक्ष्मी, (8) Floating of lamps in river, (9) Splendid Divālī at Benares (1888).	

In the foregoing study of the history of the *Diwali* festival I have confined my evidence as far as possible to non-Purāṇic sources, as the chronology of the Purāṇic sources is not definite, I hope now that many of my friends who have made a close study of the Purāṇic sources will throw more light on this festival of lights by linking up the Purāṇic sources with the chronology of this festival as recorded in the present paper for a period of about 2000 years from the beginning of the Christian era upto the present day¹

¹ Since this paper was drafted I have sent for publication in the *Journal of the Dr. Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Allahabad* a paper on "The *Sukhasūptikā* of the *Nilamata Purāṇa* (between A. D. 500 and 800) and the *Āditya Purāṇa* quoted by Hemādri (C. A. D. 1200) and its relation to the modern *Diwali* festival" — I have further received the following replies to my inquiries about *Diwali*, which would be useful for further investigation in this field —

(I) Mm. Prof. P. V. Kane writes on 22-1-1946 —

"The 4th volume of my work (*History of Dharmasāstra*) will deal with festivals and *vratas*. Therefore, so far I have written nothing about the *Diwali* festival. From my notes I find that Hemādri quotes स्कन्दपुराण and भविष्यपुराण for lighting lamps in *Diwali*, similarly the मदनपारिजात quotes बृहन्ननु, the विविद्विशीय quotes ब्राह्मपुराण. The निर्णयसिन्धु also quotes these and the कल्प रत्नाकर (pp 386-395 and p. 413) has something to say about आभिनरात्रिमहोत्सव and यमद्वितीया".

(II) Dr. A. P. Karmarkar who is now working on Purāṇic Culture at the Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay, has kindly sent me the following references to *Dipāvali* from the *Purāṇas*, on 1-2-1946 —

(1) पद्मपुराण (उत्तरखंड, chap. 122); (2) वायव्यपुराण (chapter 92 - verses 53 ff. — Note also the दशावतार in the ब्रह्माण्डपुराण); (3) स्कन्दपुराण (वैष्णव खण्ड - कार्तिकमासमाहात्म्य, chapters 9 ff.).

(III) Dr. A. N. Upadhye (Kolhapur) writes about Jain *Diwali* on 26-1-1946. — "The *Diwali* is the most important festivity with the Jains. Lord Mahāvira attained Mokṣa on the कार्तिक वद्य अमा (in the South अभिन वद्य अमा). The Jains practically all over India celebrate the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira by illuminating lights on the night of the New Moon in the month of Kārttika, the कल्पसूत्र remarks: "Since the light of intelligence is gone, let us make an illumination of material matter" (see S. B. E. Vol. 22, pp. 264-266). The era of महावीर निर्वाण begins from कार्तिक शुक्ल १. The remark of the कल्पसूत्र is the starting point for our study".

I am thankful to all the above friends for their helpful and prompt replies to my queries about *Diwali*.

My present study of the history of the Divāli has been prepared in space-time context. The time-context has been made sufficiently clear in the table given above. As regards the space-context I may observe that the sources used in the present study pertain to the celebration of the *Divāli* from Kashmir to Madras at such places as Multan, Kashmir, Kanauj, Delhi, Agra, Gujarāt, Chhattisgarh (C. P) Mahārāstra, Poona, Mālkhed (in Nizam's Dominions), Vijayanagar, etc. This space-context shows the national, character of the *Divāli* from very early times. Yaśo dhara, therefore is right in putting the *Yaksarā'ri* (or *Divāli*) in the category of *Māhīmani* (national) festivals mentioned by the *Kāmasūtra* as distinguished from the *deśya* (provincial or regional) festivals.

JURIDICAL STUDIES IN ANCIENT INDIAN LAW

10. *Different Types of Deposits*¹

BY

PROF. DR. LUDWIK STERNBACH (Poland)

Abbreviations:— *Amar.*— *Amarakośa* ed. by L. Loiseleur Deslongchamps, Paris 1839, *Āp*—*Āpastambīya Dharmaśāstra* ed. by G. Buehler, Bombay, Sanskrit Series 1892-94, *B.*—*Baudhāyana Dharmaśāstra* ed. by E. Hultsch in "Abhandlungen fuer die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Vol. VIII., Leipzig 1884, *Brh.*—*Brhaspati Smṛti*, reconstructed, ed. by K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Vol LXXV, Baroda 1941, *Col.*—*Digest on Hindu Law on Contracts and Successions with a Commentary* by J. Terapananana trans by H. T. Colebrooke, Vol. I London 1891, *Dh*—*Dharma-kośa*, Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa, Vivādapadśm ed. by L. Joshi, 1938, *G.*—*Gautamiya Dharmaśāstra*. The Institutes of Gautama ed. by A. F. Stenzler, London 1876, with *Maṣārī Bhāṣya* ed by L. Srinivasacharya, Mysore 1917, ed by M. N. Dutt in the "Dharmaśāstra Texts" Vol I Calcutta 1908, *Hal*—*Halāyudha's Abhidhānatatnālikā* ed by Th. Aufrecht, London 1861, *Hem*—*Hemacandra's Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* ed by O. Boethling and Ch. Rieu, St Petersburg 1847, *K.*—*Kautilya's Arthaśāstra* ed by R. Shama Sastry, Oriental Library Publications Sanskrit Series No 37 / 64, Mysore 1924, *Kath.*—*Kaṭhāsaritāgāra* ed by H. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1839, *Kāty*—*Kātyāyana Smṛti* ed by P. V. Kane, Bombay 1933, *Mbh*—*Mahābhārata* ed. Calcutta 1824-1839, *Mn*—*Mānava Dharmaśāstra* with Kullukabhatta, Nirṇ. Sag. Press, Bombay 1886, ed by Pandya, Bombay 1913, *Mṛcc.*—*Mṛcchakatika* ed by N. B. Godbole, Bombay 1896, *N*—*Nārada Smṛti* with *Nāradaśāstra* of *Asaḥya* ed by J. Jolly in Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1885, *Pañc*—*Pañcatantra* ed by J. G. L. Kosegarten, Bonn 1848, *Ragh*—*Raghuvamśa* ed by A. F. Stenzler, London 1832, *Rāj.*—*Rājataranginī* ed. by M. A. Stein, Bombay 1892, *Rām.*—*Rāmāyaṇa* ed by A. W. V. Schlegel, Bonn 1838, *Śāk.*—*Kālidāsa's Śākuntala* ed by C. Boethling, Bonn 1842, *Sar.*—*Sarasvatī-Vilāsa* ed by Rev. Th. Foulkes, London 1881, *Smr. C.*—*Smṛti-Candrikā* by Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa ed. by L. Srinivasacharya, Mysore 1916, *Sukr.*—*Sukranitisāra* ed by Oppert, Madras 1882, *Vās.*—*Vāsisṭha Dharmaśāstra* ed by A. A. Fuchrer in "Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series" No. XXIII Poona 1930, *V.*—*Viṣṇu-Smṛti* ed by M. N. Dutt in the "Dharmaśāstra Texts" Vol. II, Calcutta 1909, *Viv.*—*Vivādacintāmaṇi* from *Vācaspatimīśravīracarita* (Rāmacandraśāstrīyavagīśasodhitā) 1894; *VM*—*Vyavahāra Mayūkha* of Bhaṭṭa Nilakaṇṭha ed. by P. V. Kane, 1926; *Y.*—*Yājñavalkya Dharmaśāstra* ed by A. F. Stenzler (*Yājñavalkya's Gesetzbuch*) Berlin-London, 1849 with Mitākṣarī's (*Mit*) Commentary of Viṣṇuśeṣara by W. L. S. Panākar in Nirṇ. Sagor Press, Bombay 1936, with Viramitrodaya (*Vir.*) Caukhamb Śaśakṛta-Granthamālā; with Aparārka's Commentary in *Anandāśramasamskṛtagranthāvalī* (*Apar.*).

¹ See also my No. 11 "Law of Deposits"

I

1. *Contract of Deposit*

Deposit is a contract whereby one person delivers a movable thing to another for gratuitous safe custody. *Depositum* as well as *commodatum*, *mandatum* etc are species of *fiducia*.

2. *Depositum - Fiducia*

The *Smṛtis* very often use the word "*depositum*", whilst meaning *fiducia*. We find several sorts of deposits in the *Smṛtis*. Some of them are in reality specific varieties of deposits (e. g. sealed deposits, open deposits, etc.), but by far the greater number are not deposits from the point of view of the theory of law, but some specific contracts in which *fiducia* plays a prominent role. However, as the *Smṛtis* and their commentators class these relative, specific agreements among contracts of deposit, therefore, from the point of view of the theory of ancient Indian Law, we must consider them as contracts of deposits, although from the general point of view of law these contracts have nothing to do with the contracts of deposits, or are only slightly connected with these contracts.

3. *Synonyms*

In the Sanskrit nomenclature we find three most important synonyms for the word deposit i. e. निक्षेप, उपनिधि and न्यास. From the legal point of view the difference between these three synonyms is very slight. Other words are also known for the designation of the deposit.

Hemacandra in *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*¹ quotes these three synonyms,² Halāyudha in *Abhidhānaratnamālā*⁴ quotes निक्षेप and उपनिधि as synonyms⁴ and Amarakośa⁵ mentions उपनिधि and न्यास as synonyms⁶.

II

A. *Open deposits*4. *Quotations*

The word निक्षेप from नि° (down, into) + ण्विप् (to throw, to lay, to cast), the laid down, the delivered, the preserved, the entrusted i. e. a deposit, is used in Mp., N., Brh., Vi, Vir., VM. as the principal word for the designation of a deposit.

¹ 870² निक्षेपोपनिधि³ I-82⁴ निक्षेपः स्यादुपनिधि⁵ II-9-81⁶ पुमान् उपनिधिर्न्यासः

It is quoted in Hem. as synonym of उपनिधि and न्यास and in Hal. as synonym of उपनिधि.¹

Mn. (VIII-4) enumerating eighteen titles of law mentions निक्षेप and quoting the classification of offences (XI-57) also uses this word. In addition Mn. quotes निक्षेप in the chapter relating to deposits (VIII-179-181, 185, 186, 188, 190-192, 194, 196, 149). Mn. also uses the word उपनिधि (VIII-185, 186, 149) and considers it as another kind of deposit (VIII-196). However, it must be noted that for a "sealed" deposit Mn. uses the word समुद्र (VIII-183).

Although N. (16) in enumerating the titles of law uses the word उपनिधि and Asahāya commenting on these rules does not mention the word निक्षेप at all, it must be emphasized that N. in other places almost exclusively uses the word निक्षेप (N. II-1, 5, 7-10, 13). N. defining the deposit also employs the word निक्षेप and regulating the problem of the sale of things not from the owner also quotes the word निक्षेप (N. VII-1) and repeating in I-81 the text of Mn. (VIII-149) uses both the words निक्षेप and उपनिधि. N. (II-14) also contains a general rule according to which the rules relating to निक्षेप, as general rules, have to be applied to पाचित, अन्वाहित, शिल्प, उपनिधि, न्यास and प्रतिन्यास. In the text of N., which is not published in the edition in "Bibliotheca Indica" by J. Jolly, and is quoted by Mit. (M. Y. II-65), in VM. (p. 190, 10-11) etc.² N. distinguishes between निक्षेप and उपनिधि and gives good definitions of both these kinds of deposits.

Chapter XI. of Brh., which deals with deposits, is entitled निक्षेप. All the other kinds of deposits are classed in Brh. under निक्षेप (XI-1, 15). However, Brh. seldom employs the word निक्षेप for the designation of the deposit (XII-1). Brh. differentiates between निक्षेप and औपनिधिक (XI-2), or न्यास (XI-3) as well as न्यास and अन्वाहित (XII-2) and expresses the opinion that all the rules contained in the Chapter XI also relate to अन्वाहित, पाचित, शिल्पिन्यास, etc. (XI-18).

Vi. only mentions the word निक्षेप for the designation of the deposit (V-169 / 171, XXXVI-3, LII-4).

¹ See § 3. ² Vir., Parāśaramādhava.

Vir. on the other hand uses the words निक्षेप and उपनिधि promiscuously. Mitramisra begins the relative para regarding deposits (p. 493) with the words निक्षेपं विवादपदमाधिकृत्याह and concludes (p. 496) with the words इति उपनिधिप्रकरणम्. Commenting on N. (VII-1) Mitramisra says that the term निक्षेप includes by implication याचित and other species of deposits. This statement is probably based on N. (II-14).

VM (p. 190/6) entitles the chapter regarding deposits - निक्षेप but uses as synonym of the term deposit the word न्यास and understands by it all kinds of deposits.

Other sources of law consider उपनिधि as the principal word to designate the deposit but also admit the term निक्षेप for the meaning of deposits.

Y. uses the word उपनिधि and निक्षेप (Y-II-25) separately and in N.-III-230, which is similar to the sentence found in Mn (XI-57), uses the word निक्षेप. Y does not consider the word उपनिधि as identical with निक्षेप and states (II-67) that the same rules apply to निक्षेप as to उपनिधि.

Kāty considers the word उपनिधि as the principal word for the designation of the deposit. We read there, that कयप्रोषितनिक्षिप्तवन्धान्वाहितयाचितम् (592) are identical with the उपनिधि¹ Kāty. promiscuously employs the words याचित (595), न्यास (596/7), उपनिधि (601), निक्षेप (592, 593, 598, 599) in the text and concludes by saying that all the rules enumerated in the relative chapter refer to all sorts of उपनिधि (602).

K (177) also mentions the word उपनिधि as the principal word for the designation of deposits but extends the relative rules to निक्षेप (180/6).

Vās., in which Smṛti we find very little mention of deposits and in which the rules contained in Mn (VIII-149) and N. (I-81) are repeated, mentions the word उपनिक्षेप for the designation of the deposit.

We also find the word निक्षेप in the sense of a deposit in Pañc.² Kath.³ Sāk.⁴ and others.

¹ कयप्रोषितनिक्षिप्तवन्धान्वाहितयाचितम् ।

यैश्च वृत्त्यर्थितैश्च सोऽर्थस्तूपनिधिः स्मृतः ॥ Kāty. 592

² Prath I, 16 etc.

³ Tar. 7, v 79.

⁴ 97-1.

5. Definition

The Smrtis do not give us a juridical definition of the निक्षेप. Only unpublished text of N. quoted by Mit. etc. remarks :

असंख्यातमविज्ञातं सखुद्रं यत्निषीयते ।

तं जानीयादुपनिषि निक्षेपं गणितं विदुः ॥¹

Hence उपनिषि is a sealed deposit when its contents are not counted and known, and the निक्षेप is an unsealed deposit when the contents are counted.

This definition seems to be right. Probably developing it Mit. (*ad Y I-67*, p. 163/25) remarks समक्षं तु समर्पणं निक्षेपः. In connection with the preceding sentence it is therefore evident that according to Mit. if delivery of the deposit was performed in the presence of the owner then this kind of deposit is called निक्षेप ; *eo ipso* in this case the deposit will be counted.

Vir. (p. 494/26-27) on the basis of the opinion of N, mentioned before, accepts a specific form of निक्षेप. This commentary is of the opinion that if an article described in the presence of an artisan (शिल्पिनं) and handed over to him for preparing into an ornament is a निक्षेप. We shall see later on that this is not a निक्षेप but a शिल्पिन्यास², however, we observe here the same *essentials* which were found in N. and Mit. : *e* handing over of the object deposited or entrusted with somebody in the presence of the owner and counted. This is also an open deposit and not a sealed one.

How obscure the definition of the निक्षेप is, can be seen from the fact that the two, best experts and translators of K. understand निक्षेप in two entirely different ways. R Shamasastry translates निक्षेप as a sealed deposit (180/6 sqq) and J. J. Meyer as an open, unsealed deposit (284/26) We do not find in K any definition of निक्षेप and it is not clear from the context whether उपनिषि or निक्षेप is a sealed or unsealed deposit, so that no reason exists why K. should be quite different from N., Y and their commentators. Therefore, it would appear that J. J. Meyer's opinion that निक्षेप should be translated as an unsealed, open deposit is right.

It must be admitted that the निक्षेप is an unsealed deposit handed over to the depositary in the presence of the owner.

¹ VM. p. 190/10-11, Mit. *ad Y.* II-65 p. 162/25-26

² See §. 17.

It has to be pointed out that N. (II-1) remarks :

स्वं द्रव्यं यत्र विश्रम्भाक्षिपत्यविशङ्कितः ।

निक्षेपो नाम तत्प्रोक्तं व्यवहारपदं बुधैः ॥

" Where one entrusts his property to another in confidence and without suspicion, that is termed निक्षेप, a title of law. "

We observe that in N. (II-1) a very clear and exact definition of निक्षेप is given, however, in reality, it is the proper definition of the deposit in the most general sense of this word and not a species of deposit called निक्षेप. The best proof of that might be the fact that in the last *śloka* according to VM (p. 190/8-11) this general meaning of निक्षेप is divided into a specified निक्षेप and उपनिधि.

6. उपनिक्षेप

Y. (II-25) enumerates in addition to निक्षेप the उपनिक्षेप from उप° (at, by, beside, near, with) + °नि° (down, into) + °क्षिप (to throw, to lay, to cast), the laid down by, the entrusted with.

Y. mentions the उपनिक्षेप in the *śloka* identical with Mn (VIII-149), N (I-81), Vās (XVI-18) and K (191/2). All these *Smṛtis* enumerate in the respective *ślokas* निक्षेप and उपनिधि (निक्षेपा-निधि). Y. however uses the word निक्षेप instead of the word उप-निक्षेप. We read there .

आधिसीमोपनिक्षेपजह्वालधनैर्विना ।

तथोपनिधिराजस्त्रीश्रात्रियाणां धनैरपि ॥

If we comment on this sentence which relates to not losing deposit, etc. by adverse possession, with identical quotations from other sources quoted above, we come to the conclusion that no difference exists between the निक्षेप and the उपनिक्षेप and that both mean " open deposit ". This is also the opinion expressed by Mit where we read . उपनिक्षेपो नाम रूपसंख्याप्रदर्शनेन रक्षणार्थं परस्य हस्ते निहितं द्रव्यम् (Mit. ad Y II-25 p 137/25-26). Consequently उपनिक्षेप is a chattel placed for safe custody in another's hand after exhibiting its quality and quantity. The same definition of उपनिक्षेप can also be found in Vir : उपनिक्षेपः परस्य समीपे सङ्ख्यादिना परिच्छिन्ने समर्पितं वस्तु (Vir. ad Y. II-24/25 p. 436/5-6).

However, the उपनिक्षेप is defined in quite a different way in Śūlapāni's *Dīpakalikā* (ad Y. II-25). Śūlapāni states that the उपनिक्षेप is a deposit placed in a vessel without mentioning details

of what is deposited and with a seal. Śūlapāni, based on N., as he states, gives for the word उपनिक्षेप the definition of उपनिधि. Possibly the preposition उप was misleading for Śūlapāni and, therefore, he considered in error उपनिक्षेप as sealed deposit. This can also be surmised from the fact that Śūlapāni refers to N. where we do not find the word उपनिक्षेप but only the words निक्षेप and उपनिधि.

B. Sealed Deposits

7. Quotations

उपनिधि from उप* (at, by, beside, near, with) + *नि* (down, into) + *धा* (to put, to lay, to bring) what is put into with somebody, a deposit, or औपनिधिक (creating a deposit) is considered in some *Śmṛitis* as the principal word for the designation of deposits.

It was said above that Hem. quotes उपनिधि, निक्षेप and न्यास as synonyms, Hal उपनिधि and निक्षेप and Amar उपनिधि and न्यास.

Y., Kāty, and K. consider उपनिधि (औपनिधिक) as the principal word for the designation of deposits.

Y (II-67), as was mentioned above, classes all the rules relating to deposits under the word उपनिधि. Y. (II-25) also uses the word उपनिक्षेप and उपनिधि.

Kāty (592) considers several kinds of deposits as equivalent to उपनिधि¹ and uses the word उपनिधि promiscuously with other synonyms for this word.

In K. the heading of the relative chapter is औपनिधिक (p. 177/12), then K. employs the word उपनिधि (p. 177/13 sqq.) but later mentions that the rules relating to उपनिधि must also be applied in case of निक्षेप (p. 180/6). K. uses also the word उपनिधि next to निक्षेप (p. 191/2) in the chapter relating to prescription.

Mn. (VIII-196) differentiates between उपनिधि and निक्षेप and in other places mentions उपनिधि as well as निक्षेप: e. when regulating that both these deposits should not be handed over to the next-of-kin (VIII-185) and when regulating the problem of prescription (VIII-149). When regulating this last problem N. (I-81), Vās (XVI-18), K. (191/2) and Y. (II-25) also mention उपनिधि next to निक्षेप.

¹ See § 4.

In addition उपनिधि is mentioned in Mbh. (I-4899).¹

8. Definition

We find the definition of उपनिधि or औपनिधिक in N. (II-5), Brh. (XI-2), Y (II-65). It must also be noted that N. (16) enumerating the eighteen titles of law mentions उपनिधि as one of them, although (in the second chapter) considers निक्षेप as the principal word for the designation of deposits. N. (quoted in Mit *ad* Y. II-65, VM. and others) differentiates also between उपनिधि and निक्षेप.²

Mit. defines उपनिधि (*ad* Y. II-25 p. 136/27), Vir. (*ad* Y. II-24/25 p 439 and *ad* II. 65-67 p 493/19), Śūlapāni (*ad* Y. II-25 and 67), Viv (p 26 basing the definition on Katy. and Śukr. औपनिधिक II-327) considering this word as the principal for the designation of a deposit)³

The definition of the उपनिधि or औपनिधिक found in different *Smṛtis* is not uniform although, in rule, it is admitted in the *Smṛtis* that the उपनिधि is a sealed deposit.⁴

Vir states briefly that उपनिधि is a special kind of deposit तदौपनिधिकं नाम निक्षेपाविज्ञेय (Vir p 493/19).

Exhaustive definitions of उपनिधि can be found in N (II-5), Y. (II-65), Brh. (XI-2) and N. (quoted in Mit. *ad* Y II-25, etc). In addition उपनिधि is also defined in Vir. (*ad* Y. II-24/25), Medh (*ad* Mn. VIII-148), etc.

The *Smṛtis* state: अन्यद्रव्यव्यवहितं द्रव्यमव्याहृतं च यत् ।

निक्षिप्यते परगृहं तदौपनिधिकं स्मृतम् ॥ (N, II-5),

वासनस्थमनाख्याय हस्तेऽन्यस्य यद्वर्त्यते ।

द्रव्यं तदौपनिधिकं प्रतिदेयं तथैव तत् ॥ (Y. II-65),

अनाख्यातं व्यवहितमसंख्यातमदर्शितम् ।

सुद्राद्धितं च यद्वत्तं तदौपनिधिकं स्मृतम् ॥ (Brh. XI-2),

असंख्यातमविज्ञातं समुद्रं यन्निधीयते ।

तज्जानीयादुपनिधिं निक्षेपं गणितं विदुः ॥

(N in Mit. *ad* Y II-65 p 162/25).

¹ For details See § 4

⁴ See §. 4.

² Śukr defines also deposits in similar way.

⁴ It was mentioned before that K. does not give any definition of उपनिधि and Shamasasatṛi translates उपनिधि as an open deposit and निक्षेप as a sealed deposit; the other way round J J Meyer, whose translation seems to be better, See §. 5,

उपनिधेर्माण्डस्थानामपरिच्छिन्नानां ।

(Vlr *ad* Y. II-24-25 p. 436 / 7-8)

Hence a chattel, property (द्रव्य) which being placed in a box (बासन, Y. II-65) or a pot (भाण्ड, Vlr.) or hidden in another thing (N. II-5) or, as mentioned most clearly in other *Smṛtis*,—under a seal (समुद्र, N. in Mit *ad* Y. II-65, or मुद्राङ्कित in Brh. XI-2) or covered with cloth and sealed (Medh *ad* Mn. VIII-148) without being described (अनाख्याय in Y. II-65, असंख्यातमदर्शितम् in Brh. XI-2) or without being counted or known (असंख्यातमविज्ञातम् in N. in Mit. *ad* Y. II-65) or measured (अपरिच्छिन्नानां in Vlr) is deposited in other people's houses (परगृहे, in N. II-5) or in the hands of another — is called उपनिधि. In other words when a chattel is given under seal to another person for deposit or if the depositary does not know what is deposited with him, this kind of deposit is known as उपनिधि.

Some of the commentators explain what is to be understood under a sealed or hidden article in another thing. These are, as explained, things which are unknown to the depositary, i. e. he does not know whether it is gold, or silver, or pearls, or necklaces, etc. tied up and secured by a private knot prevent its being taken by another person or secured by the impression of a seal on which special letters are engraved (Col. p. 403/4 based on Asahāya *ad* N).

That is one kind of definition of the उपनिधि. However, Medh (*ad* Mn. VIII-148) who in the beginning defines the उपनिधि in a similar way to the definitions mentioned above states that it is better to take an उपनिधि as standing for what is given for use through friendliness and favour. Most probably in this instance he bases his opinion on Mn. (VIII-196) The opinion expressed in *Dipakalkā* (*ad* Y. II-25) is similar. Śūlapāni states that उपनिधि is a deposit made over for use out of affection. This point of view completely changes the meaning of the sealed deposit, of which one of the *essentials* is the fact that the depositary does not know what he takes into deposit, and moreover, cannot use it. The use of a deposited object also completely changes the character of this agreement. Therefore, it must be admitted that this definition is wrong. Even Śūlapāni, in another place, we can say, admits that he was wrong (*ad* Y. II-25) as *ad* Y. (II-67) expresses the opinion that the use of the deposit without the consent of the depositor is not allowed and he who does it should be fined. It must also be borne in mind that only *Dipakalkā* and Medh. are of the

latter opinion though all the other *Smṛtis* define उपनिधि as sealed deposit.

C. Secret Deposits

9. Quotations

न्यास from the legal point of view is the least important synonym for the designation of deposits.

Hem. enumerates न्यास as one of the three synonyms along with निक्षेप and उपनिधि and Amar. as one of two : *et* along with उपनिधि.¹

Asahāya (*ad* N. 16) divides the deposits *inter alia* also into न्यास Kāty. (592) enumerating various kinds of deposits (उपनिधि) does not mention न्यास as one of them This *Smṛti*, however, uses this word promiscuously with उपनिधि, निक्षेप and याचित (593, 603)

Brh. promiscuously employs न्यास with निक्षेप (XI-9, 19) and considers it from the point of view of law as a special kind of deposit, and gives a special definition of न्यास (Brh. XI-3) In addition, Brh. in the chapter relating to the sale of different articles by an unauthorised person, not the owner, (अस्यामिन्) mentions न्यास, निक्षेप and अन्वाहित, separately stating, in this way, that these three deposits are different from each other (Brh. XII-2).

Y. and N. also consider न्यास as the different sort of deposit as it is stated in these *Smṛtis* that the rules relating to उपनिधि or निक्षेप apply also *inter alia* to न्यास (Y. II-67, N II-14).

It must also be added that in N., in which *Smṛti* the word निक्षेप is considered as the principal word for the designation of a deposit, in the chapter relating to proofs by ordeal to take place in the case of the denial of a deposit, the word न्यास is used (N. I-241).

B. (II-1, 2, 3) considering the stealing of a deposit, and the like, as an offence causing loss of caste, also uses the word न्यास for the designation of deposits

Śukr. (IV-5, 310) uses the word न्यास in addition to याचित and अन्वाहित.

Generally speaking the word न्यास was considered in literature, and *so ipso* colloquially, as the principal word for the designation of deposits, although in juridical nomenclature it

¹ See S., Hem. (870), Amar. (II, 9, 81).

was a specific and rather infrequent sort of deposit ¹ And so we see in *Mṛoch.* that Vasantasenā entrusting the jewels to Cārudatta uses the word न्यास (णस). Similarly this word is also used by Vidūsaka and Cārudatta ² In *Rāj.* we also find the word न्यास in the chapter relating to a certain man of means who deposited a lakh of money in the house of a merchant. ³ *Rāj.* also prefers the word निक्षेप for the designation of a deposit. ⁴ In *Śāk.* (act IV-97) the word न्यास is also used for the designation of deposits, ⁵ similarly in *Ragh.* ⁶ and *Kath.* ⁷ (when referring to the deposit of the whole estate with the merchant Hiranyadatta or Hiranyagupta and tricks used by Upakośā). ⁸ Even Rām uses the word न्यास for the designation of the deposit. ⁹

¹ See § 10.

² Vasantasenā — अञ्ज अलिश्रं । परिसेमु णासा णिक्खिअिअन्ति ण उण गेहेसु
(Act I p. 69/628-629) Cārudatta धिदुसुसं न्यासः सत्ययम् (Act I. p. 69
633) Vidūsaka: णासो पस सो । Cārudatta कथ न्यासः । Vidūsaka:
समस्तसदु भव । जइ णामो चोणे अवहदो तुमं किं मोहं उवगदो । Act III.
p. 155/382-385)

Cārudatta यं समालम्ब्य विन्यासं न्यासोऽस्मात् तथा रुतः ।

तस्येतन्महता मलयं प्रत्ययस्यैव दीयते ॥ Act III. p. 161/353-354

³ सोहृदागूढसद्भावे व्यापदोपयिकं धनी ।

न्यासीचकार दीन्नागलक्ष कोपि वनिष्गृहे ॥ (VIII-124). See also
VIII. 126, 151.

⁴ See VIII-147

⁵ अर्थो हि कन्या परकीय एव तामय संश्लेष्य परिग्रहीतुः ।

जाता ममाय विशदः प्रकाम प्रत्यर्पितिन्यास इवान्तरास्मा ॥

Śāk. Act. IV, 97.

⁶ स विसृष्टस्तथेत्युक्त्वा धाता मेवाविशतुर्ग ।

नन्दिभ्रामतस्तस्य राज्यं न्यासमिवाभुनक् ॥ *Ragh* XII-18.

⁷ *Tar* 4.

⁸ वणिग् चिरण्यगुप्तो मे भर्त्रा न्यासकृतं धन ।

जिहीर्षति इति विज्ञप्तम् तत्र राजा तथा स्वय (Kath. *Tar*. 4/72)

Kath. uses also in addition to न्यासीकृत the words अर्पिधान, स्थापित
धान, etc

⁹ पादुके चास्य राज्याय न्यास दावा पुनः पुनः ।

निवर्तयामास ततो भरत भरतामजः ॥ *Rām*. 1, 1, 37.

as well as Mbh., ¹ Bhāgavata Purāṇa² and many others.

It must be noted that Mit. (ad Y. II-67) uses in addition to न्यास the word न्यस्त, a special kind of deposit i. e. gold, etc. for preparing bracelets, etc.³ Mit. classes this kind of deposit under "and others".—From this commentary it is evident that न्यस्त is nothing more than शिल्पिन्यास.⁴

10. Definition

From the legal point of view न्यास is a deposit which was entrusted to a member of the house in the absence of the owner and without being shown to him with the mandate to be handed over to the owner of the house. Therefore, न्यास can be considered as a secret deposit. This definition is absolutely identical with that found in Mit. and Vir. (ad Y. II-67).

Mit. states : न्यासो नाम गृहस्वामिनेऽदर्शयित्वा तत्परोक्षमेव गृहजनहस्ते प्रक्षेपो गृहस्वामिने समर्पणीयमिति । (ad Y. II-67 p. 163/24-25).

Vir. states : न्यासो गृहस्वामिनेऽदर्शयित्वा तत्परोक्षमेव तदीयजनहस्ते प्रक्षेपो गृहस्वामिने समर्पणीयमिति । (ad Y. II-67 p. 494/24-26).

This is the real definition of न्यास. Brh. (XI-3) is also of the opinion that the contract of deposit (न्यास) takes place in the house of another man and adds the motive for the commitment of the deposit. Brh states that it takes place through fear of the king, robbers or other dangers or for the purpose of deceiving the heirs. We read there :

राजचीरारातिभयाद्वायादानां च वञ्चनात् ।

स्थाप्यतेऽन्यगृहे द्रव्यं न्यासस्तत्परिकीर्तितम् ॥

(Brh. XI-3)

Identically *Dīpakārikā* (ad Y. II-67). Such a fear is also described in K. (180/19-181/2) where, however, the word निक्षेप is employed.⁵

¹ I-6137

² In Viṣṇu Purāṇa V. 8, 16, IX, 14, 20

³ आदिशब्देन सुवर्णकारादिहस्ते कटकादिनिर्माणाय न्यस्तस्य सुवर्णादेः

(Mit ad Y. II. 67 p. 163/25-26). See §. 18.

⁴ See §. 18.

⁵ कृतलक्षणेन वा द्रव्येण प्रत्यानयने तवालिशजातीयो वा राशौ राजदायिकाक्षज-
भूतिः सारमस्य हस्ते निक्षिप्यामकच्छेत् । K. 180/19-20 See also J. J. Meyer *Das altin-
dische Buch von Welt und Staatsleben* p. 786/78.

If we admit that the only *essentials* of the न्यास—deposit is the lodging of an object in the hands of a person for safe-keeping “in the house of another man” then we understand clearly why Mroch., Rāj., Kath., etc. have used the word न्यास and not निक्षेप or उपनिधि. However, it must be admitted (Śāk. and others) that the word न्यास was principally employed, and in literature too, for the designation of deposits

D. Mutual Deposits

11. Quotations

The mention of प्रतिन्यास from प्रति° (towards, over, against, in sight of) + न्यास (deposit), a deposit towards another, is to be found in N. (II-14). There it is pointed out that the rules relating to deposits also apply *inter alia* to प्रतिन्यास.

Mit. (ad Y. II-67 p. 163/26) basing his opinion on this quotation also understands under “and others” the प्रतिन्यास—deposit.

12. Definition

The definition of प्रतिन्यास is to be found in Asahāya's commentary (ad N. II-14) and in VM. (ad N. II-14 p. 193/3).¹ Under this expression an agreement of a re-deposit or a mutual deposit must be understood. According to this agreement both parties exchanged deposits with one other (प्रतिन्यासः स्वामिना एव निक्षिप्तं तेनाप्यन्यत्र निक्षिप्तं)² with the words “you should keep this thing of mine, and I shall keep this thing of yours”.

We can say that from the legal point of view in this case two different contracts of deposit take place at the same time. The depositaries are depositors as well as vice versa.

It must be noted that other *Smṛtis* do not regulate this kind of deposit.

E. Loans for Use

13. Quotations

याचित or याचितक—deposit from याच्° (to ask for, to request, to sue for) is classed among deposits (उपनिधि) in Katy. (592) and in Asahāya's commentary on N. (16) when enumerating eighteen titles of law. Y. (II-67, II-14) and Brh. (XI-18)³ also state the same; both these *Smṛtis* state that the general rules relating to deposits have also to be applied to याचित or याचितक.

¹ and by Nilakaṇṭha.

² VM p. 193/3.

³ याचित.

Y. (II-238) quotes the word याचित when discussing the problem of the use by the washerman of the objects given to him and penalties to be imposed for such use (*ten pamas*)

G. (XII-42) and Kāty. (595) use this word when regulating the responsibility for negligence or *us mior* in the case of loss or destruction of an object which was याचित

Vir and Smr. C. commenting on Kāty. (606/7) express the opinion that the rules of deposits apply to याचितक.

Śukr. (IV-5, 310) uses the word याचित besides न्यास, अन्वाहित, etc.

Matsya Purāṇa (quoted in Dh *ad* उपनिधि) and Aparārka (p. 664) quote याचित besides निक्षेप

14. Definition

In spite of all the quotations mentioned above it is very difficult to admit from the point of view of the system of civil law that याचित is a deposit

VM. gives the following definition of the याचित-याचितसुद्राहादी शोभाषर्थं नीतमलकारादि

Vir. states विवाहायुत्सवार्थं वस्त्रालङ्कारादिकं प्रतिदेयतयाङ्गीकृत्य याचि-
त्वानीतं याचितं । (*ad* Y. II-67 p 494; 21-23).—Similarly *Dīpikālikā*
(*ad* Y. II-67).

Consequently it is evident that according to this contract clothes, ornaments and the like are loaned to a person on the occasion of a marriage or similar festivity for adornment purposes. These objects are given without any consideration of interest, as Śukr rightly mentions twice (II-327, 381)¹ This opinion also conforms with that of Pāṇini (4, 4, 21) who says that याचित (याचितक) are articles lent for use free of interest.

From the conclusions noted above it is evident that याचित (याचितक) from the point of view of law are loans for use and not deposits although some *essentials* were the same in both agreements. That is probably the reason why the *Smṛtes* class the याचित amongst the उपनिधि (Kāty, N.) and apply to these contracts the general rules relating to deposits. Therefore, from the point of view of the system of ancient Indian law we have to class याचित among deposits

अवृद्धिक गृहीतान्यालंकारादि च याचितं (II 327/655)

सवृद्धिकमृणं दत्तमकुसीदं तु याचितं । (II. 341/681)

F. Deposits for Delivery

15. Quotations

अन्वाहित from अनु° (thereafter, afterwards, further on) + °आ° + (to, upto, at) + °दा° (to lay, to give); i.e. what is given afterwards further on, is according to the *Smṛtis* a specific form of deposit.

Katy. (592) classes अन्वाहित among उपनिधि and Asahāya commenting on N. (16), when enumerating the eighteen titles of law in subdivisions of deposits, quotes अन्वाहित.

Y (II-67), Brh. (XI-18) and N. (II-14) are of the opinion that the rules relating to deposits (उपनिधि, निक्षेप) also apply to अन्वाहित.

Brh. (XII-2), regulating the problem of sale without ownership, mentions अन्वाहित besides न्यास and निक्षेप.

Sukr (IV-5, 310), discussing the problem of things which must not be handed over to others even in times of danger, enumerates अन्वाहित along with याचित and न्यास.¹

16. Definition

None of the *Smṛtis* give any definition of the अन्वाहित - deposit. We observe, however, some definitions in the commentaries on the *Smṛtis*.

Mit. states यदेकस्य हस्ते निहितं द्रव्यं तेनाप्यनु पश्चादन्यहस्ते स्वामिने देहीति निहितं तदन्वाहितम् । (at Y. II-67 p. 163/22-23)

The definition found in Vir is almost identical. We read there अन्वाहितं स्वामिना एकस्य हस्ते निहितं द्रव्यं तेनाप्यनु पश्चादन्यस्य हस्ते तस्याधानुर्वचनाभिहितं । (at Y. II-67, p. 494/23-24).

The explanation of the अन्वाहित is clearer in the VM., although this definition is worse from the legal point of view. We read there: अन्वाहितममुकेन मयि स्थापितं च त्वया तस्मै देयमिति पुरुषान्तरहस्तेर्पितम् । (VM. p. 192/13-14)

On the basis of these three commentaries we have to come to the conclusion that the contract of अन्वाहित took place if the owner A. committed to the care of B. an object and this B lodged it afterwards, further on, in the hands of C with the clear mandate to return it to the owner A.

¹ uses also the word निक्षेप.

From the point of view of law not one but several separate contracts were performed in this case. Firstly there is the performance of the agreement between A. and B., according to which an ordinary contract of deposit took place. However, according to the contract of deposit B. was obliged to return the deposited object to A. In the case of the अन्वाहित—deposit B. concluded an additional agreement with C. according to which he obliged C. to return the deposited object to A. i. e. to the owner of this object. The commentators do not state whether the agreement between B and C was concluded with, without or against the will of the owner of the deposited object. As no objections are raised in the *Smṛtis* against this kind of deposit, we can admit that this agreement was concluded with or without the will of A., but never against his will.

The agreement between B and C is, above all, a contract of deposit (sub-deposit) joined with the mandate (*mandatum*) to return the deposited object not to B. but to the owner of the deposited object—A.

Therefore, the अन्वाहित is a deposit for delivery.

We find in the *Smṛtis* besides the अन्वाहित also the अन्वाधि from अद् (thereafter, afterwards, further on) + आधि (pledge) : i. e. a pledge which should be given afterwards, further on. This word is found in Kāty. (611) where it is defined in the following way :

अनुसारेण कार्येण अन्यस्मिन्वचनान्मम ।

दयास्वमिति यो दत्तः स इहान्वाधिरुच्यते ॥

This definition is similar to that quoted above and, therefore, the word अन्वाधि is identified with अन्वाहित, which does not seem to be correct as it is composed also of आधि (and not of धा-हित), which means a pledge.¹

G. Deposits with an Artisan

17. Quotations

शिल्पिन्यास from शिल्पिन् (artisan) + न्यास (deposit) or शिल्पि उपनिधि from शिल्पिन् (artisan) + उपनिधि (deposit) or शिल्पिद्रस्तगत from शिल्पिन् (artisan) + हस्त (hand) + गत (from गम् being in) is according to the *Smṛtis* a special kind of deposit.

We find शिल्पिन्यास in Brh. (XI-18),² Viv. (p 25/26), VM.

¹ See Mīśra and Bhavadeva (quoted in Col. p. 406) on 'pledge transferred'

² See also XI. 19.

(p. 193/4, 194/8, etc.), शिल्पे उपनिधि in N. (II-14) and शिल्पिहस्तगत in Asahāya's commentary on N. (16).

Brh. (XI-18) and N. (II-14) extend the rules regarding deposits to शिल्पिन्यास or शिल्पे उपनिधि. Nevertheless it must be pointed out that Y. in the *śloka* II-67, which is almost identical with the two quotations mentioned above, does not contain any mention of शिल्पिन्यास, or the like.

However, under " others " (आदि) this kind of deposit could be understood although neither Mit. nor Vir. mentioned by name शिल्पिन्यास, or the like. Vir. (*ad* Y. II-67 p. 494/26-27) defines namely deposits with an artisan calling them निक्षेप and Mit. (*ad* Y. II-67 p. 163/25-26) न्यस्त. ¹

Also Kāty. (592) does not mention शिल्पिन्यास, or the like, but it is evident from *śloka* 603 sqq. that this kind of deposit is known to Kāty. too. The same applies to K. where शिल्पिन्यस्त or the like is not mentioned in the relative chapter relating to deposits but from another place (180/9 sqq.) it is evident that this kind of deposit is known to K. too. K. uses in this para, for the designation of an artisan, instead of the word शिल्पि, the word कारव.

Asahāya (*ad* N.-16) enumerating the eighteen titles of law mentions as one of the kinds of deposits the शिल्पिहस्तगत i. e. what has been put into the hands of an artisan.

VM. (193/4) interpreting Kāty. (603) uses the word शिल्पिन्यास and then, further on, referring to some special rules connected with this kind of deposits, uses also the same word.

Viv. quoting and interpreting Brh. (XI-18 and 19) uses also the word शिल्पिन्यास.

18. Definition

We do not find in the *Smṛtis* any definition for the word शिल्पिन्यास, or the like. We find it, however, in the commentaries on the *Smṛtis*.

We read in Viv. (p. 25) : शिल्पिन्यासोऽलङ्कारणादिघटनार्थं शिल्पिषु समर्पिते सुवर्णादी.....

We read in VM (p. 192/24-25) शिल्पिन्यासो हेमकारादिषु कुण्डलाद्यर्थं निक्षिप्तम् ।

Vir. calling this kind of deposit निक्षेप says : शिल्पिनेऽलङ्कारावि-
घटनाय द्रव्यसमर्पणं च साक्षादारब्धाय । समर्पणं निक्षेपः (Vir. *ad* Y. II-67
p. 494/26-27) and Mit. calling it न्यस्त states as follows :

आदिशब्देन सुवर्णकारादिहस्ते कटकादिनिर्माणाय न्यस्तस्य सुवर्णादेः ।
(Mit. *ad* Y. II-67 p. 163/25-26).¹

From these quotations it is evident that under the शिल्पिन्यास, or other similar expressions, must be understood an object given to an artisan in order to perform a particular piece of work. This is *e. g.* giving of gold to a goldsmith in order to make from it earrings, necklaces etc

From the point of view of the theory of law this contract is not *depositum* but *fiducia* because the aim of deposit is to give a movable thing for the purpose of gratuitous safe custody. In this case, however, the aim of giving a movable thing is the giving of material to an artisan for the purpose for its manufacture. The duties of such an artisan are similar to those of the depositary and probably, therefore, some of the *Smritis* class the giving of objects to an artisan for manufacturing among deposits. However, from the point of view of the theory of ancient Indian law we must admit that शिल्पिन्यास, or the like, are considered as deposits. In any case we have to keep in mind that such a precise *Smṛti*, as the Y. is, rightly does not class the शिल्पिन्यास under the contracts of deposit

H. Property of a Minor

19. Quotations

पोगण्ड or पोगण्डधान from पोगण्ड (a minor) + धान (property) is according to N. the sixth species of deposits. We read there :

प्रतिगृह्णाति पोगण्डं यश्च सप्रधानं नरः ।

तत्याप्येष भवेद्धर्मः पहेते विषयः समाः ॥

Also Asahāya commenting on N. (16) and enumerating the eighteen titles of law mentions पोगण्डधान.

20. Definition

The only definition of this " deposit " can be found in Asahāya (*ad* N. II-15). We read there :

¹ See § 9

य अनार्थं बालं सप्रधनं नाथाबुद्ध्या प्रतिगृह्णाति यस्यापि पूर्वोक्तस्वेव विधिर्द्रष्टव्यः । षडेते विधयः । षडेते विधयः समा इति ।

Hence this is the property of a minor. This kind of the contract of deposit, according to N., takes place when a man takes a wealthy minor, who has no guardians, into his house. Then the property of the minor is subjected to the rules relating to deposits. In this case the child, whose father and mother are deceased, is deposited by the king or on his behalf with a man who has to take care of the orphan. As the orphan-minor cannot dispose of the estate left by his father, the guardian has to take care of him similarly to a thing committed to his care.

In this case too, from the legal point of view, it is impossible to class this case under "deposits." This is a *tutela data* and the depositary is in reality a *tutor datus* who has similar pecuniary obligations towards the minor as a depositary towards the depositor. However, here too, N. is of the opinion¹ that it is a special kind of deposit. Therefore, we have to consider it, from the point of view of the system of ancient Indian law as a species of deposits.

1. Other Kinds of Deposits

21. क्रयप्रोषित, बन्ध, वैश्यवृत्त्यर्पित

In Kāty. (592) we read : क्रयप्रोषितानेक्षितबन्धान्वाहितयाचितम् ।

वैश्यवृत्त्यर्पितं चैव सौर्धस्तूपनिधिः स्मृतः ॥

We see here that Kāty. classes, in addition to the deposits quoted above, the following contracts under deposits: क्रयप्रोषित, बन्ध and वैश्यवृत्त्यर्पित.

क्रयप्रोषित from क्रय° (purchase) + °प्रोषित (from प्र° + °वृत् going home, going abroad) is an object sold but still in the hands of the vendor. It is not a deposit from the point of view of the theory of law, but a *constitutum possessionum*.

बन्ध is a pledge, it is an article entrusted to a pledgee, but not a deposit, although the pledgee has similar duties to perform as a depositary.

वैश्यवृत्त्यर्पित from वैश्य° (merchant) + °वृत्त्य (दानि) (from वर- to reach) + °अर्पित (from अर्, to bring) is an object lodged in the hands of

¹ ... षडेते विधयः समाः (N. II. 15).

a trader. It is also not a *depositum* but *fiducia*. Here also the trader has similar duties to perform as the depositary.¹

22. आदि

Y. (II-67) and N. (II-14) use also the word आदि i. e. "and the like" after having enumerated याचित, अन्वाहित, न्यास (Y.), or याचित and अन्वाहित (N.)². Vir. (ad Y. II-67 p. 494/27 sqq.) understands under this expression things bought but not paid and like others mentioned in G. (XII-42). G. states there :

निध्यन्वाधियाचितावक्रीताधयो नष्टाः सर्वाननिन्दितानपुरुषावराधेन ।

Therefore, these kinds of *fiducia* have also to be considered, from the point of view of the theory of ancient Indian law, as contracts of deposit³.

J. Distinction of Deposits from the Point of View of Civil Procedure

23. Deposits given before witnesses or verbally

From the point of view of civil procedure N. (II-6) and Brh. (XII-5) differentiate between deposits given before witnesses (साक्षिमानित or ससाक्षित⁴) or verbally and in private (प्रोक्त⁵ or राहोदत्त).⁶

The deposit was given verbally when the depositor had the highest confidence in the depositary. However, the depositary had to abstain from this kind of contract and the contract of deposit before witnesses or writing should be concluded in order to avoid any misunderstanding regarding the kind of deposit and that the depositary is not forced to be tried by ordeal (see Viv p. 23/4).

We see here that this distinction between deposits is not important from the point of view of civil law but civil procedure only and, in particular, from the point of view of evidence in case of an eventual lawsuit.

¹ See also a similar case of *fiducia* in K 198/17 and many others.

² as well as शिल्पे उपनिधि, न्यास and प्रतिन्यास

³ See §§. 9, 11, 17, 18.

⁴ from साक्षिन् or साक्षिक — witness.

from प्र + षच्.

⁶ from गृहस् + ऽदत्त.

III MAHĀBHĀRATA NOTES*

BY

V S. AGRAWALA

1 शिशुमार शिरः.

In October 1938 I had written to the late Dr. V. S. Sukthankar to enquire the meaning of the expression शिशुमार शिरः occurring in Ādiparvan, 185. 16 (Vulgate text). In reply he wrote to me:— 'I am not sure about the meaning of *śiśumāraśiraḥ*, in Ādi. 185. 16. Our *old* group of Northern Mss. has 'puram' while Southern Mss. read 'girim'. We have accepted 'puram' for our Critical text, and I take that it was some place—a suburb—near Drupada's capital, where a special camp was erected for the Svayamvara'.¹ Subsequently I published my interpretation of the word in the Journal of India Society of Oriental Art for 1939, suggesting that शिशुमार शिरः could best be explained as an architectural term implying the architrave of a torana carved with an alligator's head. The meaning had come to me by looking at the old gateways of the Sanchi stūpa in which the torana beams are finished off in volutes at both ends decorated with alligator's head and coiled fish tail. This meaning suits the context admirably. In response to king Drupada's proclamation of the *svayamvara*, many kings, Rsis, sages and Brāhmanas flocked to his capital from different places to participate in and witness the ceremony. Those kings were well received by Drupada with respect due to their rank (Ādi. 176. 14). Then we have:

ततः पीरजनाः सर्वे सागरोद्धूतनिःस्वनाः ।

शिशुमारपुरं प्राप्य न्यविशंस्ते च पार्थिवाः ॥

(Critical text, I. 176. 15)

* Mahābhārata Notes I, A. B. O. R. I., Vol. XXI, pp. 280-284.
Mahābhārata Notes II, A. B. O. R. I., Vol. XXII, pp. 19-22.

¹ Letter No. Gen. 3494 of 1938-39, dated 5th Nov., 1938.

i. e. on the next day the citizens of the capital and those royal guests proceeded with rumbling deep noise to the शिष्टुमार शिर (keeping the Vulgate reading) and entered (the समाजवाट).

Then the poet describes in elaborate detail the architecture of the samāja-vāṭa furnished with प्रकार and परिखा, i. e. first a moat then an outer wall, and then the द्वारतोरण or the main gateway in the enclosure wall which gave access to the inner grounds. Inside it were rich pavilions and palaces (बितान, प्रासाद) furnished with many articles of comfort and show [Ādi, 176. 16-93]. The Epic description faithfully reflects the early Indian architecture of cities and city-gates as found in many places in the Buddhist and Jain literature (cf. Milinda, I. 34 and 380 ff.). As Dr. Coomaraswamy has shown The most conspicuous and necessary parts of a city are the moat (*parikhā*) and rampart (*prākāra*), gates (*dvāra*, *gōpura*), more specifically gate-houses (*dvāra-kotthaka*) with their defence towers (*dvāra-attālaka*) and the king's palace (*prāsāda*, *harmya*, *rāja-niveśana* *vimāna*, etc) [Early Indian Architecture, Cities and City-gates, Eastern Art, 1930, p. 211]

The Epic writer has in my opinion preserved in the word शिष्टुमारशिर a conspicuous feature of the early Indian gateway architecture. The voluted ends of the architraves or temple cross beams were adorned with figures of fish-tailed alligators in a very attractive and prominent style. This feature impressing even a casual observer of the Sanchi gateways persists upto the Kushāna period in the art of Mathura. It should, however, be mentioned that this artistic feature which is so very common in the style of the Sanchi toranas is conspicuous by its absence at Bharhut where only the spiral motifs are carved on the two ends of the beams. I should also note that I am unable to quote any other evidence from early Jain or Buddhist literature to corroborate the above explanation which can therefore be taken at best a suggestion deriving its force from the evidence of available architectural styles of early Indian art.

Dr. Sukthankar referred my suggestion to Dr. P. K. Acharya whose explanation was a bit different from mine as Dr. Sukthankar wrote to me 'I have been pursuing the question

of the best interpretation of the word *śiṣumūrasūrah*, and in that connection I wrote to Prof P K. Acharya of Allahabad University. I have now heard from him that he prefers the reading *sūrah*, and opines that it is an architectural term. In his opinion it means *not* architrave of gates, but "the hand-rail on the balustrade of the gallery of pavilion marked probably at the bottom by the head of crocodile". This gallery of pavilion, in his opinion, was probably reserved for the *Paurāṇāh*. He refers me to *Mānasāra Vāstusāstra* (30-78-80) where there is mention of "stair-case of elephant's trunk pattern said to be decorated with lion faces."

I am sending you the information for what it is worth. I cannot make much of it myself. But it might give you a clue for further investigation '1

Although I cannot agree with the suggestion of Dr. Acharya I think we can understand his meaning. He seems to suggest that in the pavilion (बिमान) inside the समाजवाट there were seats for the kings on the ground floor and an upper gallery for the sight-seeing परेजना, to which a stair-case was leading. The hand-rail on the side of this stair case was decorated with the head of crocodile, and this decoration was carved at the bottom near the first baluster or upright post. If I am right in understanding Dr. Acharya's meaning I should say that no doubt there were upper galleries and stair-cases (cf. सुखारोहणसोपान in the present passage, Ādi. 176. 20) with small hand-rails as found in the representations of early Indian art, yet I think that the term शिष्टुमार शिर. as applicable to this small baluster is, for one thing, of much weaker force than if applied to the full-fledged toraṇa architrave, and for the other does not seem to hold good in the present context. A careful reading of the passage (Ādi 176. 15-26) makes it quite clear. The शिष्टुमार शिर. according to the Epic was approached by the citizens and the kings and the question of any upper gallery being reserved for the former does not arise. The obvious and natural inference is that the शिष्टुमारशिरः (whatever be its meaning) was approached by the guests as the first thing before they made their entry into the arena.

Having accepted the reading शिशुमारशिरः to be the correct one as dictated by the propriety of meaning I had entertained doubts regarding its textual support since Dr. Sukthankar wrote to me : ' Our old group of northern Mss. has ' puram ' while Southern Mss. read ' girim '. We have accepted ' puram ' for our Critical text. ' In the printed footnotes to the Critical edition only Ms K4 of the Kashmiri version gives शिशुमारशिर and D4 of the Devanāgarī version शिशुमारशिरः, all others record पुरं or गिरिम्. Besides the fact that feeble textual support is not always the final argument in rejecting an otherwise superior reading,¹ we have here a good reason for the belief that शिशुमारशिरः represents the original reading. It is a very fit example of *lectio difficilior*, i. e. the more difficult text preserving the correct reading, which in process of simplification was substituted by a reading palpably easier of comprehension. But all doubt about it is now set at rest by the discovery of the oldest extant Ms of the Ādiparvan from Nepal which according to Pandit Hemaraja is between seven hundred and eight hundred years old and which the learned General Editor of the Mahābhārata hailed as a discovery of capital importance for Mahābhārata studies. The reading of this Ms. is शिशुमारशिरः (Sukthankar Epic Studies VII, Sukthankar Memorial Edition, Vol. I, p 382), and this to my mind sets the seal of final approval on this debated reading.

2. वेपाघ्न

In the first part of these Notes (A. B. O. R. I. XXI, p. 280) I had explained the expression वेपाघ्नपरिवारितरथः (Sabbā-parvan, 51. 34) as 'chariots mounted with tiger's skin' on the basis of Pāṇini's sūtra वेपवेपाघ्नद्वयम् (IV. 2. 12) occurring under the general rule परिवृतो रथः. The references quoted there seem to permit the inference that the use of *vayūghra* chariots was a privilege enjoyed by kings and princes. The *vayūghra-paritāruta ratha* referred to in the Sabbā-parvan (51. 34) was itself brought as a present to King Yudhisthira on the occasion of his

¹ Compare the reading उपसृताः in Āraṇyakapāvan, 229. 5. 'Vasudeva B. Agrawala has suggested the emendation of उपसृतास्त्वपि (of the Vulgate) to उपसृतास्त्वपि (which is our reading). Though rather feebly supported by Ms. evidence, it is undoubtedly the correct reading'. (Dr. Sukthankar's Critical Notes to the Āraṇyaka-pāvan, p. 1106).

Rājasūya ceremony. The Atharvaveda mentions as an essential part of the Rājasūya sacrifice the striding by the king on a tiger's skin :—

व्याघ्रो अधिवेयाघ्रे विक्रमस्य विशो महीः

'Stride forth to broad regions, thou, a tiger, on a tiger's skin' (Atharva IV. 8 4). According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. शार्ङ्गलचर्मोपस्तृणानि (V. 3. 5. 3) the stepping on the tiger's skin was a necessary feature of the Rājasūya ceremony.

The word *vayāghra* in the Atharvaveda passage implies the skin of a tiger and not a chariot covered with it as known to Pāṇini. It appears that the tiger's skin on which the king walked at the time of the ceremony was subsequently spread to cover his seat in the war-chariot, which was therefore designated as वेयाघ्र by the force of the *vr̥tti* explained by Pāṇini as परिदृत्तो रथ (IV. 2. 10)

Besides the references to the वेयाघ्र chariots in the Mahājanaka-jātaka (Vol. VI, pp 48-50) and the Vessantara-jātaka (Vol VI, pp. 503-504) I have come across to two more references in the Epics themselves. We read in the Rāmāyana that Rāma mounts the वेयाघ्र chariot when he leaves his palace with Sumantra to see king Dasaratha before his selection as *Yuvārāja*.

ततः पावकसंकाशमारुरोह रथोत्तमम् ।

वेयाघ्रं पुरुषव्याघ्रो राजितं राजनन्दनः ॥

(Ayodhyā, 16 28)

The other reference is from the Sabhā-parvan, 51. 4 —

अय सहस्रसमितो वेयाघ्रः सुप्रवर्तितः ।

सुचक्रोपस्करः श्रीमान् किंकिणीजालमंडितः ॥ ४ ॥

मंद्गादनो राजरथो य इहास्मानुपावहत् ।

जंत्रा रथवरः पुण्यो मेघसामरनिःस्वनः ॥ ५ ॥

This records the fact that the वेयाघ्र chariot of युधिष्ठिर cost one thousand. The figure 1000 standing above should be taken to imply 1000 silver Kārsāpanas. This is supported both from the Pali and Sanskrit literatures. 'Quite in keeping with this is the fact that in early Buddhist works when any big sums of money are specified, no name of coin is adduced, that of Kārsāpapa being understood as is quite clear by its occasional mention. Kārsāpapa was, therefore, looked upon as the standard

coin'. [D. R. Bhandarkar, *Ancient Indian Numismatics*, p. 79]. In Pāṇini sūtras V. 1 27 and 29, *śahasra* stands for 1000 *Kārsāpanas*.

The epic expression *सहस्रसमित* requires explanation. It is to be understood in the light of the sūtra *सहस्रसमितौ चः* (IV. 4. 135), that which is equal to one thousand is *सहस्रसमित* (*Kāśikā*, *समित-सुत्य. सहश'*). Strangely enough both for Pāṇini's sūtra and for the epic verse the variant reading *सहस्रममित* is recorded.

केचित्तु समिताविति पठन्ति । तत्रापि समित्या समित एव लक्षयितव्यः । तत्र छन्दसि प्रयोगदर्शनात् । (*Kāśikā*), i. e. some read *समित* instead of *समित*, but the meaning will be the same as that of *समित*. In the Epic the reading *समित* in this place is very feebly supported by a couple of Mss. only, but in the *Anuśāsanaparvan* in a similar context (not yet critically) edited we have the vulgate reading *समित*—

शतेन निष्कगणितं सहस्रेण च समितं । 93. 43.

i. e. each udumbara fruit filled with a nugget of gold was equal to 100 *niskas* or 100 *Kārsāpanas*. Here metrically *समित* appears to be the correct reading in case the text be not interpolated.

Incidentally the above passage of the *Anuśāsana* is also important for giving as the numismatic ratio between one *niska* of gold and one *kārsāpana* of silver, the latter being one-tenth of the former in value.

3. पूर्वयायात and उत्तरयायात legends .

In *Mahābhārata* Notes-I, it has been pointed out in another connection that the *Kāśikā* quoting most probably an old *सूर्याभिविक्त* illustration on Pāṇini VI 2 103 (*दिक् शब्दा ग्रामजनपदाख्यानचानगटेषु*) refers to *पूर्व यायातं* and *उत्तर यायातम्* (p. 284) Now I find that these names for the two parts of the *Yayāti* legend are authenticated by the Critical edition itself. The chs- 71-80 of the *Ādi* dealing with *Yayāti*'s casting off his old age in exchange for the youth of his son, his marriage and begetting sons are called *पूर्वयायात*, the colophon at the end being *पूर्वयायातं समाप्तं*. Similarly the chs 81-88 narrating the story of *Yayāti*'s fall from heaven and his reascension constitute the *उत्तर यायात* portion finishing with the colophon *उत्तरयायातं समाप्तं* (p. 389 of Critical Edition). The text also names it as the *उत्तरकथा* of *यायाति* cycle :

हन्त ते कथयिष्यामि ययातेरुत्तरां कथाम् ।

दिवि चेह च पुण्यार्था सर्वपापप्रणाशिनीम् ॥ 81. 9.

The उत्तरयायात begins and also ends with a कलञ्जुति which is a sure sign of its once having an independent existence. It appears to be the traditional example of Pāṇini's sūtra (VI. 2. 103) as suggested by Patañjali quoting it on a vārttika to sūtra IV. 2. 60 in exemplifying *ūkhyānas*, and it may thus be inferred that the Yayāti legend before its being incorporated into the bulk of the Epic possessed an entity of its own and was being independently made a subject of study by reciters designated as the यायातिकाः. Its floating existence is attested to by its forming part also of the Matsya Purāṇa, chs 36-42.

4. प्रवेरिता

In reply to an enquiry about the grammatical derivation of the word प्रवेरिता, Dr Sukthankar wrote to me

'The word *praveritā* in 1. 68 73 is no doubt difficult and has not been satisfactorily explained so far. The word occurs about half a dozen times in Mahābhārata, and its meaning is also certain. It is a *lect diff.*, as shown by the variants *vasajitā*, *naūkṛtā*, *pravasitā*, *praveritā* etc. There is as far as I know no corresponding root in Sanskrit. Nilakantha (to Mahābhārata 1 19 24 Bombay edition) derives it as *pra + (a)va + īritā*, with elision of *a* of *ava*, according to Bhāguri (अत्र उपसर्गस्य भागुरिभतेन अकारलोपः). Do include it in the next instalments of your Mahābhārata notes. It would be interesting to have your explanation''

The Ādi-parvan verse is as follows —

मेनका निरनुकोशा बन्धकी जननी तव ।

यया हिमवतः पृष्ठे निर्माल्येव प्रवेरिता ॥ 68. 73. Poona Edition.

The other references² are —

(1) वीर्यामर्षप्रवेरितैः (Bhīṣma 108. 31.).

(2) भीष्मबाहुप्रवेरिताम् (Bhīṣma 119 30.)

¹ Letter No. Mbh 4826 of 1942-43, dated October 27, 1942.

² For these I am indebted to the kindness of Dr S. K. Belvalkar, General Editor, Mahābhārata. All these references are from the Vulgate—Bombay edition, published by the Chitrashala Press, Poona.

(3) तां शखवृष्टिमनुलां द्विपहस्तेः प्रवेरिताम् । (Karna. 81. 13).

(4) पपात चांचैरमरप्रवेरितं विचित्रपुष्पोत्करवर्षमुत्तमम् ।

(Śalya. 57. 68.)

(5) मेदोरुधिरयुक्तेश्च श्लिखवाहूरुपाणिभिः ।

निकृत्तोदरपादैश्च तत्र तत्र प्रवेरितैः ॥ (Svargā 2. 21.).

The meaning which satisfies all these contexts is undoubted, viz. 'thrown about, cast hither and thither, cast away'. In the Ādi. itself (68 69) we have an indication of its meaning—अवकीर्णं च मां याता परात्मजमिवास्ती । Now I must admit that I am unable to offer any natural grammatical explanation of the word प्रवेरिता, but I feel certain in connecting it with the dialectical Hindi root पवेरना, to scatter, to sow seed by throwing, also written पवेरना = छितरा कर बीज बोना (*Hindisabdasāgara*, p 2039-40) ; from it पवेरा (verbal noun) = the act of sowing seed with the hand (Platt's Hindustani Dict., p. 282), also called पवेड की बुआई, and same as चखेर or डीटा ¹ It appears that in the old spoken Sanskrit (Bhāṣā) there was a root from which प्रवेरिता was derived and which has now survived in the current dialects. In Hindi we get another connected root पँवारना having the sense सेत में छितराकर बीज बोना, (*Hindisabdasāgara*, p 2038), used in classical Hindi in the poetry of Jāyasi (कँरुन कर इक आदि पवारा, p. 222 of Shukla's edition) and Tulasi (बहुत अगद प्रभु पास पँवारे) The personal name पँवारू given to a male child who after its birth is cast away by the mother and then repicked to ward off evil omens (cf similar names as फिक्कू, बहाऊ, छाहू, सांहु from सांहु धान्वादेश for क्षिप, जैन पुस्तक प्रशस्तिसंग्रह p. 179-180), is from the same root, of which the original was surely connected with प्रवेरित.

5 महापराह्णे

In the Critical edition of the Ādi-parvan (181. 40) occurs the following verse

महन्यथापराह्णे तु घनैः सूर्य इवावृतः ।

ब्राह्मणैः प्राविशत्तत्र जिष्णुर्ब्रह्मपुरस्कृतः ॥

In the above महति अपराह्णे ('on the great after-noon'), though apparently not presenting any difficulty, is an instance of a very refractory text which has never been satisfactorily explained

¹ In the agricultural glossary of Meerut there are the five kinds of sowing seed (1) वैर (2) बुई (3) पवेड (4) चोखरी (5) गाहन.

The attempted simplification by substituting *भवत्यथापराह्णे* (N3 Da Mss.) is extremely poor and the other readings recorded in Critical apparatus (*महान्यथा*^o; *अधन्यथा*^o, *महताथ वरारोहा*) are worthless. The original reading is absolutely certain supported by all the versions and good manuscripts. The meaning of the śloka is that while Kuntī was cast into deep anxiety about the safety of the Pāṇḍava princes who had gone to attend the Svayamvara ceremony of Draupadī and who were delayed there beyond reasonable time, Arjuna entered the house surrounded by the Brāhmanas, like the sun surrounded by the clouds on the great Aparāhna day. The question is whether the phrase denotes any and every afternoon as is usually understood, or any particular 'afternoon' in the year? It is obvious the point of comparison can hold good, not on all days of the year, but only in the rainy season. The Brāhmanas clad in black antelope skins (*गौरवाजिनवासिभिः*, Adī 181. 35) overshadowed Arjuna who was putting on a *कुष्माण्निन* (185. 2) in the same manner as masses of dark clouds cover the sun. What was this *महापराह्णे* day of the rainy season which suggested itself to the mind of the poet in preference to all other similar days?

An answer to the question can perhaps be given with some certainty. According to Kautilya the *आषाढी* day, i.e. the full-moon day in Āśāḍha was the last day of the govt. financial year (*कर्म सबत्सर । तमाषाढीपर्यवसानं* etc Arth. text, p 63) ' On the Āśadhi day must all the accounts be presented by the various departments (*गणनिकयानि आषाढीमागच्छेयुः*, Arthasāstra p 64) to the Accountant General whose duty it was to hear the totals (*अग्र*) of the receipts and expenditure (*आय-व्यय*) and of the net revenue (*नीचि*) and also to receive into Government treasury the net balance of the *nīva* (*आयव्ययनीचीनामग्राणि श्रुत्वा नीचीमवहारयेत्*, ibid. p. 64) The *आषाढी* was the most important day of the fiscal year for transacting many outstanding items of business and closure of balances. The offices and Government account-books on this day had to be kept open for a much longer period than was usual. The *आषाढी* day is also referred to in the Rāmāyana as the day on which the king had to apply closure to all departmental business (of the year) and finished receiving all kinds of goods and stocks for his stores department.

निवृत्तकर्मायतनो नूनं संचितसंचयः ।

आषाढीमभ्युपगतो भरतः कोशलाधिपः ॥

(Kiskindhā, 28. 55).

While witnessing the beauties of the rainy season Rāma's thoughts go out from his immediate environs on the Mālyavat hill to Bharata's administrative routine in Ayodhyā and naturally he thinks of the closing business transactions of the fiscal year (कर्मसंवत्सर) and of the collecting of cereal stores proper to the Āsādhī day.

The next day after the Āsādhī would be the new year's day coinciding with first day of Śrāvana. Dr. Shamasāstri has shown that *Vyusta* in the Arthasāstra denoted the new year's day which was the first day of the financial year commencing just after the full-moon day of Āsādhā (Arth. Trans. pp 59, 64 and Preface, xxiv, also his paper *Vyusta* on the Vedic new year's Day in the Proceedings of the 2nd Oriental Conference). The *Sūryasiddhānta* records in words of undoubted meaning that the new year began with the longest day in the month of Śrāvana (Proc. 2nd Oriental Conf. p 38) This longest day seems to have unmistakable reference to the महापराह्ण day which beginning from the morning of the आषाढी day was reckoned upto the morning of the व्युष्ट day, and was in this manner literally the 'great afternoon' day.

The Epic reference to the महापराह्ण finds striking corroboration from Pāṇini Sūtra VI 2 38 regulates the accent of the first portion of the following words—viz. महाव्रीहि, महापराह्ण, महाप्राष्टि, महेश्वास, महाजावाल, महाभार, महाभारत, महाहैलिहिल, महारौरव and महाप्रवृद्ध. Each one of these, as I have shown elsewhere, ¹ was a term, not of general application, but of specific meaning. Pāṇini also records another word for the closing day of the year viz. संवत्सरतम (V. 2. 57) His reference to the Vyusta day (V. 1 97, व्युष्टादिभ्योऽणर) is of deeper significance in connection with the महापराह्ण reference. The derivative word वेयुष्ट denoted payments made on the व्युष्ट day as also the body of transactions or work disposed on that date (तत्र च दीयते, तत्र च कार्यं, V. 1. 96). From the nature of the meanings taught in the Astādhyāyī there seem to

be strong reasons for the belief that he was using *व्युष्ट* in a special sense which is identical with that of the *Arthasāstra*, i. e. the New Year's Day. The Head of the Accounts Department caused to be checked and verified the total receipts and expenditure and the net revenue of the closing year and this transaction would appropriately be termed *व्युष्ट कार्य* or *व्युष्ट* payments. The span of the *आषाढी* day would conveniently extend into the dawn of the *व्युष्ट* day for the terminal entries of the year and the heads of the ledgers would be kept open for much longer hours on this day. Thus although not the longest day of the year in the number of hours between sunrise and sunset, the *महापराङ्ग* day would be considered virtually the longest accounting day in the whole year and thus only its appellation of 'the great afternoon' be justified.

For our passage in the *Mahābhārata* (1. 181. 40) the meaning that would suit in the context would be As on the last day in the month of *Āśāḍha* the sun is overcast by clouds, so was Arjuna overshadowed by the accompanying *Brāhmanas* clad in black skin.

6 Prati as the Name of a Coin

§ (a) *Mahābhārata* evidence

The word *prati* as the name of a Coin is of rare occurrence in literature. One instance of its literary use is recorded and that in the following verse from the *Mahābhārata*

कचिद्वीजं च भक्तं च कर्षकायावसीदते ।

प्रतिकं च शतं वृद्ध्या ददास्युणमनुग्रहम् ॥

The verse is found in the *Nārada Rājanīti* questions put to king Yudhisthira in the beginning of the *Sabbāparvan* (568). The correct rendering is as follows.—

'Do you distribute seed and food to your peasantry in distress, and do you advance agricultural relief loans to them at the concession rate of one *Prati* for each one hundred *Kāśāpīnas* ?'

The variant readings given in the Poona Critical edition are (1) प्रत्येकं, (2) पादिकं, (3) पञ्चक (4) प्रतिशक्तं and (5) प्रतियुजाशतं. The last three are extremely corrupt and hardly worth considering. The first two are accepted by the well-known commentator *Nilakaṇṭha*. He gives *pratyekam* as the Vulgate text (for the *Pratikam* of the critical edition) and explains it as implying loans at 1% of interest. His alternative reading *pādikam* is

explained as referring to an annual increase of one-fourth, i. e., Rs. 25/- for each hundred, which works out to an interest of a little over 2%. He further adds that 1% rate was for secured loans and that of 2% and a little more for unsecured loans. The explanation appears laboured and removed from the spirit of the original text. Although by his meaning of *pratyekam* Nilakantha arrives at the same rate of interest, (i. e. 1%) as that of *pratikam* we must emphasise that *pratikam* is the older and genuine reading for which not only the testimony of best Mbb. manuscripts is our guide but also the older grammatical tradition in which is preserved the correct interpretation of the word *pratika*.

§ (b) Evidence from grammatical literature

This earliest use of प्रति is recorded by Kātyāyana in grammatical literature. On Pāṇini V. I. 25 (कंसाद् दिठञ्) there is a Vārttika, कार्षापणाद्वा प्रतिञ्च, with the following *Bhāṣya*—

कार्षापणाद्विठञ् प्रत्ययो वा च प्रतिरादेशो वक्तव्यः ।

कार्षापणिकः कार्षापणिकी । प्रतिकः प्रतिकी ।

(Kielhorn II. 347)

It means that *prati* is the substitute for the coin named *kārsāpana* and the suffix *tithan* is added both from the word *kārsāpana* and from *prati* to denote the various meanings, such as 'purchased for' (तेन क्रीतम्), 'so much interest, income, profit, total-tax or bribe paid on it' (तदस्मिन् वृद्ध्यायत्ताभयुक्तोपदा दियते, Astādhyāyī, V. I. 47). Thus *pratika* would signify a transaction in which one *kārsāpana* or silver punch-marked coin was paid as the purchase money or interest etc.

This is the simple and natural explanation and in the light of this we may understand प्रतिकं शतम् as an amount of one hundred silver *Kārsāpanas* on which one *Prati* was accruing as monthly interest, i. e. at 12 p. c. per annum. Nārada calls this as the concession rate charged on relief loans advanced by government. The higher rates of interest recorded in law-books for various classes of transactions range from 2, 3 to 4, 5 per cent. Where *Prati* means a *Kārsāpana* the *śūlam* or hundred also has reference to the *Kārsāpana* coins. We find that in ancient literature when merely the figures were mentioned without specifying the name of the coin generally the standard silver punch-marked coin or

the *Kārsāpana* was intended which was the prevailing currency in Pāṇini sūtras V, 1. 21 (गताच्च उन्नयतावशते) and V 1 34 (पणपाद-मावशतायत्) the *Kārsāpana* coins are implied by the mere mention of the figure 100. In early Buddhist works when any big sums of money are specified, no name of coin is adduced, that of *Kārsāpana* being understood, which was looked upon as the standard coin. (Bhandarkar, Ancient Indian Numismatics p. 79).

§ (c) Epigraphic evidence

It is a matter of extreme good luck that we have reliable epigraphic evidence of the use of *Prati* as a current coin name in the Nasik Cave Inscriptions of *Usavadāta*, son-in-law of King Nahapāna. Nahapāna belonged to the earlier wave of Śaka invasion under the Ksabarāta branch who became masters of Western India and Ujjain in the first century B C. In inscription no. 12, it is stated that *Usavadāta* gave a perpetual endowment of 3,000 *Kāhāpanas* for the benefit of the Sangha, and invested them with two guilds, two thousand in a Weavers guild, interest one *Pratika* (monthly) for the hundred, and one thousand in another Weavers guild, interest three quarters of a *Paḍika* (monthly) for the hundred. These *Kāhāpanas* were not to be repaid, their interest only was to be enjoyed. Out of them, the two thousand (2000) at one *Pratika* per cent provided the cloth money at twelve *Kāhāpanas* to every one of the twenty monks. From the sum of the thousand (1000) - invested at an interest of three-quarters *Pratika* per cent, the pocket money was to be paid to the monks.

In the above extract we have use of the technical terms *Vṛddhi* (interest), *Kāhāpana* and *Pratika* and the interpretations are perfectly clear. The formula *Vṛddhi Paḍika Sata* is identical with that used in the Mahābhārata passage *Pratikam ca Śatam vṛddhyā*. Both have the same meaning i. e. the amount of one hundred *Kārsāpana* coins fetching an interest of one *Kārsāpana*, i. e. one per cent monthly (*Ep Ind.* Vol VIII, pp 82-83, Nasik Cave Inscriptions).

In the Kanheri cave inscription no. 15 also there is a reference to an endowment of two hundred *Kārsāpanas* at *Pratika*

rate of interest i. e. one Kārsāpana per cent per month (अखयनिवि
दत्ता काहापणानि सतानि वे २०० सघस येव हटे पडिके सते.)

Burgess, *Arch Survey of Western India*, Vol. V, pp. 79-80
The inscription is dated in the reign of Gautamīputra Śrī -
Śātakarnī who was a contemporary of Nahapāna.

§ (d) *Chronological considerations*

The literary and epigraphic references to the coin called *Pratī* point to some important chronological considerations as regards the date of the Mahābhārata passage in which the word occurs. Pāṇini mentions only the name *Kārsāpana* for the standard silver punch-marked coin of his days. The word *Pratī* as a substitute for *Kārsāpana* was unknown to Pāṇini (cir. 5th century B. C.) and it occurs for the first time in the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana (circa fourth century B. C.) It appears from the testimony of the Cave inscriptions cited above that *Pratī* was a current coin name for the Kārsāpana up to the end of the first century B. C., the rate of interest being very often expressed in terms of the *Pratī* coin. The Mahābhārata chapter containing the Nārada Rājantī should therefore be assigned to a period between the fourth and the first century B. C. It is a text dealing with those subjects of law and polity which Dr. Sukthankar rightly considers to have been grafted on the original text of the Mahābhārata under the influence of the Bhṛguś. Possibly this chapter, did not form part of the epic as it was constituted under the name of Bhārata. The position seems to have been that the *Niṭi* portions were existing independently out of the orbit of the original Bhārata text and at some favourable time the Bhṛguś incorporated them along with the Ākhyānas into the epic which emerged as the Mahābhārata as a result of this inflation. The two limits of this literary *diachronism* appear on the basis of the very solid evidence supplied by the references to the *Pratī* coin in Kātyāyana's Vārttikas on the one hand and the cave inscriptions on the other, to fall within the narrow period of about three centuries, from the fourth to the first century B. C. The probability is that the date for the introduction of this particular chapter in the epic text is nearer the earlier limit than the later. This is also confirmed by the occurrence in this context of

several other technical terms as *Lava* and *Musti* (*Sabhāparvan*, 5. 54) which are peculiarly Kautilyan and have been used in the *Arthasāstra* (IX. 1), a treatise of the Maurya period.

Post-script

Doctor F. Edgerton who has edited the critical edition of the *Sabhā-parvan* translates *Pratikam* as " apiece " (Sukthankar Volume of the Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, page 11). This would mean that King Yudhisthira advanced the sum of one hundred *Kārsāpanas* to each individual farmer which on the face of it is improbable. Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, the General Editor of the *Mahābhārata*, to whom I communicated the interpretation of *Pratikam Śatam* set forth in this paper kindly wrote to me. " In my addition to Edgerton's Addenda et Corrigenda I had already given the correct sense of the word by inserting a note which I am copying for you

Devabodha's explanation runs thus: इत प्रणि एकेकं प्रतिकम्, अथवा कं शिरः प्रति प्रतिकं प्रतिपुरुषमित्यर्थः । His alternative explanation which favours the rendering " apiece " ignores the current idiomatic use of *प्रति*, which seems to underlie his first explanation, and to which *Kātyāyana* had drawn attention in his second *Vārttika* to *Pāṇini* 5. 1. 25. The word *वृद्धि* is explained as उत्तमर्णेन मूलातिरिक्तं ब्राह्मम् i. e., the ' interest '. This hundred which is to be given as a ' relief ' loan *deserves* only one (*Kārsāpana*) as interest, and that is the main point, and not the giving of only one hundred to each needy farmer. " *Pratikam* " therefore means " *Kārsāpanikam* ", and this sense of the word is already registered in PW. "

I am grateful to Dr. Belvalkar for this information. The interpretation of the coin name *Prati* suggested itself independently to both of us against the same grammatical background.

MISCELLANEA

BHĀLUŚĀLIKA OR BHĀṆḌAŚĀLIKA ?

BY

LOKESH

In the Silver Jubilee Volume (XXIII) of the Annals, Prof. V. V. Mirashi quotes the colophon of a Nepalese MS. of the Rāmāyana on p. 293 in the course of his discussion on "Gāngeya-deva of Tirabhukti". This colophon was deciphered by Bendall, whose faulty reading has been noticed by Prof. Mirashi in his article. In the colophon occurs a word which has been read by Bendall as *bhāṇcu-śālīka* and *bhālu-śālīka* by Prof. Mirashi. Both of these readings are wrong, and it is strange that Prof. Mirashi should have passed over this word even without putting a question-mark besides it. This is perhaps due to its having been considered a 'phonetic improvement' on Bendall's reading, i. e., its sounding like a Sanskrit word! Neither of the readings conveys any sense, which is essential to ensure their correctness. Moreover, in the entire manuscript the letter *lu* is never written in the way as it is in this word, wrongly deciphered as, *bhālu-śālīka*. Further, the letter closely resembles, and is identical with, the letter *-ṇḍ-* in *paṇḍita* which occurs just a little further (folio. 376 of the MS). It has only become slightly blurred and hence has evaded the attention of previous scholars as being *-ṇḍa*. The reading with *-ṇḍa* has been adopted in "Ālikālibijaharam (A Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Abecedarium)" by the versatile scholar Dr. Raghu Vira, where the photograph and Devanāgarī transcription of the passage under consideration have been given on account of their close resemblance to the Lantsha script of the abecedarium. The correct reading of the word would be भाण्डशालिक "an official connected with the भाण्डशाला", and not भादुशालिक.

A NOTE ON THE A. CHESTER BEATTY COLLECTION

BY

G. H. Khare

Very recently I had an occasion to turn the pages of the three volumes of the monumental work¹ dealing with the collection of miniature paintings etc from the library of Mr. A. Chester Beatty. On plate 68 of the third volume is reproduced a miniature painting of the saint Shāh Dawlah the resident of Gujarat (Punjab). The foot-line describes the miniature as 'The derwish Shah Dawlat by Dilwarat'. On pp 34, 35 of the first volume (text), this painting is described thus: '(25) Plate, 68 By *Dilwarat*..... in the left hand margin of the picture is an inscription in the hand-writing of the Emperor Shah Jahan, the translation of which is The portrait of Shaykh Dawlat, who has settled in Gujrāt, Lahore Painted by Dilwarat'. It is quite clear from these remarks that the name of the artist has been deciphered as Dilwarat.²

But I very much doubt it. It is well nigh impossible to make out any meaning of the word—if it can be so called—Dilwarat. The inscription is practically devoid of diacritical marks and orthographical points, for only three letters possess orthographical points. To the rest we are to supply both according to the requirements. The last word of the inscription consists of five letters. Out of them if the first is *dāl*, the fourth must also be *dāl*, for the forms of both the letters are identical. If these two letters are compared with the *dāl* in *dawlah* and *dar*, the identity becomes still clearer. But no doubt of any sort can be raised about their being *dāls* when those four letters are compared with the letter *re* in *dar*, *lāhūr* and *raqam*. Thus the penultimate letter in the last word must be read as *dāl* and not *re*. The second letter in

¹ The Library of A. Chester Beatty A Catalogue of Indian Miniatures by Sir Thomas W. Arnold, revised and edited by J. V. S. Wilkinson, Vol. I, text, Vols. II & III, plates, London, 1935.

² The whole inscription in the margin runs thus Shāhī Shāikh Dawlah kah dar Gujrāt Lāhūr mibāshad (?) raqam Dilwarat (Devadatta).

the same word can as well be read as *yāy*. *Yāy* occurs in three more words in the inscription; but its points are nowhere indicated. I, therefore, decipher the last word as Devdat (Devadatta). It was a very common personal name in old days and the word carries meaning.

In the left hand portion of the border of the frontispiece to the third volume, I find the words '*Amal-i-Harīf*, indicating the name of the artist who executed the border. But this has not been mentioned in the text.

The foot-line to pl. 40 (b) as also the text gives the name of the artist as *Kamālī Jībīlāh*. I am doubtful of the second word. It has no meaning. It can be read as Jaisukha with some difficulty and then will carry meaning.

Pl. 41 (a) has something like '*Amal-i-Imām qulī* at the bottom. But neither the foot-line nor the text refers to this inscription which gives the name of the artist¹

¹ As far as I know nobody has referred to these discrepancies and hence I felt the necessity of writing this note.

VAISYAS AND SOCIAL ORDER

By

S. N. Tadpatrikar

“ कृषिगोरक्षवाणिज्यं वैश्यकर्म स्वभावजम् । ”

—मगवद्गीता १८.४४

A reference to lexicons will show that the word 'go' stands for many different things; but curiously enough, the Mahābhārata, at Anuśāsana parva, Adhy. 63 śl. 4, gives prominence to 'the Cow, the Earth and the Learning', stating that the gift of either of these, brings equal merit to the donor

तुल्यनामानि देयानि त्रीणि तुल्यफलानि च ।

सर्वकामफलानीह गावः पृथ्वी सरस्वती ॥

In the Adhyāyas that follow, the sacredness of the cow is dealt with at great length, and along with the story of the King Nrga, who, in spite of his great and liberal gifts, suffered the life of a lizard, owing to a slight error in giving away to a Brāhmana, another's cow, we have also the mention of Goloka, a special world where all sorts of highest pleasure are reserved for the donor of cows (MBH. XIII. 73). We leave पृथ्वी and सरस्वती for the present, and devote our attention to the cow.

Rgveda, does not seem to attach so much sacred value to the cow, and there the cow only counts as a means of wealth and prosperity. The Dāna-stuti hymns mention large herds of cows being given as Dakṣinā, to sacrificial priests, by the ruling Kings, who often performed sacrifices for their own good. These learned priests were specially called to the King's capital, and they usually had their colonies in forest-āśramas, where they could conveniently tend their flocks of cows, and lead a peaceful and happy life. Of course, looking after the cows, as also tilling land for rearing crops for their livelihood, was quite a necessity; but it is possible that as these colonists extended their field of activity, they found almost the whole of their time engaged in their main task - that of study and teaching of sacred lore, and कृषि and गोरक्ष gradually passed into the hands of their dependents and followers. These first consisted only of students, who, studying under their teachers, were asked to do these duties of farming, cow-tending and the like. The Pausya parva of the Mahābhārata gives us a concrete example of the above statement. A teacher. Āpoda Dhaumya, had three students of whom,

one Āruni from Pāñcālas, was sent to construct a bund to the field—गच्छ केदारखण्डं बधान. The water was flowing out of the field and it had to be stopped; the boy, seeing no other way, laid himself in the opening, and thus prevented water from going out—the teacher, not seeing him return home, went out in search, and called the boy, who, thereupon, showed his teacher how he had bodily held up the water. Of course, Dhaumya was pleased, and granted this sincere student proficiency in Vedas, giving him the name Uddālaka Āruni

Another student Upamanvu, was asked to look after the cows—वत्स उपमन्यो या रक्षस्व. This poor, innocent boy was put to a severe test: the teacher asked him how he managed to earn a livelihood, the boy told that he begged for food, the teacher asked all the भक्ष्य to be given to him, and when the boy did as he was told, the teacher kept for himself, all the provisions and sent the boy away without any means of feeding himself. Seeing, after some time, that the boy still kept in full vigor, the teacher again asked about the means, when the boy honestly told that he went a begging again, this, too, was forbidden him; then he fed himself on cow's milk, then merely on the froth of milk which the calves left on the udders of the cows, and when all these devices were proscribed by the teacher, the poor boy was obliged to eat अर्कपत्रा, which made him blind, and then, while finding his way back, fell into a ditch. Dhaumya then found him out, and after offering prayers to the Aśvins, the boy was restored to his eyesight.

The number of such students, however, was necessarily very limited and quite insufficient to cover all the activities pertaining to farming and cows; and help from others—इतरे—was often sought to look after these works efficiently. These others, were of course, as their very name indicates, not of the Aryan fold, and were secured from the numerous inhabitants residing in the jungles, near by. They were treated most kindly, were also initiated into the sacred Vedic traditions, and some few of them really proved most apt and capable students—an instance of such exceptional talent we find, in the name ऐतरेय, a son of इतरा—from the other's class; this ऐतरेय has a ब्राह्मण, and आरण्यक to his credit.

But most of these un-Aryans were not able to pick up the learning of their teachers and after their initiation, only did their duty of कृषि and गोरक्ष, honestly. So that the exception of ऐतरेय only proves the rule: that all of them were initiated into the Vedic fold, and attached to the duty of farming and tending the cows. These, to my mind, formed the विशः the masses, the people, the settlers of the land, and the class—name वैश्य was subsequently brought into use, as applicable to these people. The learned authors of the Vedic Index state that the meaning of this term is 'doubtful' if the above time of thinking be accepted, some light, it is hoped, may hereby serve to dispel the 'doubts' about the meaning of the terms

Another point in this connection, is that the four Varnas are given their particular distinguishing colours, - actual physical colors, not due to the mixture or predominance of the three gunas as commentators would have us believe. Mahābhārata, Śānti, 188. 5 has

ब्राह्मणानां सितो वर्णः क्षत्रियाणां तु लोहितः ।
वैश्यानां पीतको वर्णः शूद्राणामसितस्तथा ॥

and Nilakantha, the commentator explains this वर्ण as - सितः स्वच्छ सत्त्वगुण लोहिता रजोगुणः पीतक रजस्तमोऽयामिधः असितः कृष्णः तमोगुणः. A still curious statement is found further on at śloka 10 ff where, the sage Bhṛgu tells मरुतां that all men were of equal status - द्विजा - at first, but subsequently fell into Varna division according to their particular activities inspired by particular gunas; कर्मभिर्वर्णतां गता ।

The late Mr Visvanath K. Rajawade, a well known scholar of Maratha history, gives (at p. 140) in his Marathi introduction to राधाभाषविलासचम्पू, his own theory about the चातुर्वर्ण्य basing his social history mostly on Pāṇini's grammar and Vedic literature :- " Even before the oldest of R̥gvedic hymns was ever composed, Brāhmana was the only party in society; he was of a bright white colour, physically, while mentally tending towards high thoughts about God and soul. These Brāhmana Āryas came southwards, and met, on the Pamir plateau, in central Asia, the red-skinned, brave and hardy Ksatriyas, who are, in Aitareya Āranyaka, aptly compared with the Tiger of the jungle ! — क्षत्रं वा एतद् आरण्यकानां पशूनां यद् व्याघ्रः । Brāhmanas being intellectually

superior, could easily influence these brave people, and the two joining hands to make a common cause, brought into existence, the most powerful organisation, that of वसुक्षत्र, which is, so often mentioned in our ancient literature. These combined people soon came across some yellow tribes who, though not warlike, were well versed in कृषि, गोरक्ष and वाणिज्य, prominent activities of peace time. These were given the name विश्व, and they might be of the same stock as the Phœnicians or Punics of the Romans, the Panis of R̥gveda, from the west; or they might have been some offshoots of the yellow races of East Asia. Anyway, these yellow people were absorbed in the common Aryan fold, and thus was created the distinguished त्रैवर्ष्य of Vedic times!

These three groups, amicably cooperating among themselves, gradually occupied the southern parts consisting of Uttara Kuru. Hiranmaya, Ilāvṛta etc. They met the dark-skinned śūdras in Uttarakuru, and Uttaramadra, north of the Himālayas, and it was in these parts that the चतुर्वर्ष्य was regularly organised, and a complete society established. This organisation continued to be in force, as these people advanced further south, across the Himālayas and established themselves in different parts of the Indian continent.

This theory about the formation of चतुर्वर्ष्य, being discussed in a Marathi book, has not received the attention of scholars. It might be objected that it is only a subjective theory, but if we consider the matter without any bias, we shall have to admit that all such theories regarding society of Vedic or even pre-Vedic times, are bound to be more or less subjective, and when no definite conclusion can be drawn about these doubtful matters, this theory of the late Mr Rajawade, may be taken into consideration, when studying the history of those hoary ancient times.

In the limited space of the present article, it is not possible to discuss all the points at any length; and I propose now, to lay here, for the consideration of interested students, a rough outline of my own views, on this subject:

To my mind, the first two Varnas, ब्राह्मण and क्षत्रिय come from one common stock—the Aryans, who came from somewhere in the North, and occupied the regions first around the Caspian—

कश्यप (?)—Sea, and then in parts of Central Asia. While forming fresh colonies in strange lands ब्राह्मण formed the penetrating wedge-मुसल-while their brothers, the hardy and brave क्षत्रिय, protected them on both sides, thus forming the बाहु of this social विशाट पुरुष ! Both these activities required equal daring, and both having common interests at heart, there was perfect co-operation between these two Varnas. This policy of 'peaceful penetration' into new adjoining territories, was carefully followed by these Aryan settlers, even after they had successfully occupied the Northern part of India. They—i. e. the Brāhmanas, with their followers—had their colonies in the दुष्टकारण, where they had to meet the राक्षस class, and the clash between the two, or more properly, the persecution of these peace-loving Brāhmanas, led to the attack from the क्षत्रिय rulers, who were the patrons of these colonists. The motive underlying this clash and subsequent attack can be clear, when we take into consideration the point that if these rsis only wanted peaceful habitations in solitude, they could very well have settled in the territory of their क्षत्रिय patrons. And it was mainly on account of this daring missionary spirit of the ब्राह्मण, that they commanded special respect and careful attention of their क्षत्रिय rulers. The ब्रह्मसूत्र was thus a most powerful organisation of the Aryans, and it enabled them to extend their settlements all over the wide expanse of the then known earth.

These same people, had among themselves, some who possessed neither of these qualities necessary for a ब्राह्मण or a क्षत्रिय ; and it was quite natural ; you can not expect all people to be of the same calibre. So these third-class men formed the ordinary stock having nothing to lead, but simply to obey the orders of the leaders ; and this third-class continued to be greatly added to as the colonies extended over larger regions, where the indigenous people who were meek and sub-missive, were easily absorbed, and thus the whole mass formed the विशा, a class, who were engaged in peaceful pursuits of social good, those of कृषि and गोरक्ष.

For centuries together, this classification was not strict, and the three classes were equally privileged to take part in all the religious activities ; but subsequently, a large split came among

these Aryan settlers on the Caspian, and while a part of these continued to stay there—afterwards going South into *IRAN*—another section moved East and came to the highlands of Central Asia, where they met, and absorbed among themselves, the meek yellow people who found places in the third and general class, that of विशः, the dark skinned द्रव्य were probably the aborigines of the Indian soil, who could not be so easily captured, and these—द्रव्य of Rgveda—continued to trouble the settlers, for a long time, and even after their subjugation, were kept at arm's distance, being asked to do only menial labour, but in no way allowed to mix with the Aryan people, in social or religious functions. The yellow and dark colours are thus accounted for; stirring passions change white to red; so we may take the red colour of Ksatriyas, as a mark of passionate temper and of bravery, the original colour being the same—white—as that of the Brāhmanas. This original white colour is still conspicuous among our Parsi brothers, these who had settled in Iran, south of the Caspian Sea.

The addition of वाणिज्य—trade—to कृषि and गोरक्ष, fell to the lot of the वैश्य, as the people had settled in social life, cities and villages came to be built properly, and inter-communication became a regular need of society, and state. On account of their occupation as a class, वैश्य came into contact with the क्षत्र, while the two uppers forming the head and arms of society, sometimes indulged in a contest for supremacy, as references to such incidents are found in Epic and Puranic sources. But as long as the ब्राह्मण was useful as a daring leader in extending the Aryanisation of the whole land, so long the क्षत्रिय rulers were eager and careful to keep the good will of this self-less class; and it was only when the ब्राह्मण had left nothing of this sort to do, and wanted to assert his superiority merely on the strength of his religion and philosophy, that the people, especially the ruling class, showing their unwillingness to submit, came into clash; but all through these conflicts between ब्रह्म and क्षत्र, we have to note that the वैश्य and क्षत्र, remained quite indifferent, and engaged themselves in their allotted work of कृषि, गोरक्ष and वाणिज्य. The hard and fast classification, which is referred to in the भगवद्गीता, is a development that came about at a comparatively late period, of our social history of Ancient times.

AN OPENING VERSE OF THE MAHABHĀRATA

BY

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SARMA

It is well-known that the opening verse in the *Mahābhārata* differs in the various recensions of the Epic—Northern and Southern and therein again in the several texts of the Telugu, Grantha and Malayalam (Kerala) versions. It would be impossible to dogmatize as to which of these versions has the imprimatur of Vyāsa himself or is the one that most faithfully represents the original version given out by him. The task of fixing the correct original *textus simplicior* of the Epic must be left an open one or perhaps to specialists in the field of Epic-study and criticism. The great Critical Edition of the Epic taken up by the Bhandarkar Institute may be expected to solve the question provided all the manuscript materials are tapped which does not seem still to be the case. My task in this paper is but a very modest one of bringing to the notice of scholars and students of the Epic, the existence of a Version (I do not go so far as to dub it a Recension) of the Epic known to and commented upon in the thirteenth century by the great Vedantic philosopher Śrī Madhvācārya and which opened with the benedictory verse

नारायण सुरगुरुं जगदेकनाथं भक्तप्रियं सकललोकनमस्कृतं च ।

त्रैलोक्यवर्जितमजं विभुमायमीशं बन्धे भवघ्नममराहुरसिद्धबन्धम् ॥

From the evidence of Mss. let in by the Critical Edition of the Epic published by the Bhandarkar Institute, we find that the above śloka occurs in only one of the texts of the South Indian Recension—the Kerala or Malabar version and there too in only one of the three manuscripts collated (Cochin State Library No. 1). But the antiquity and genuineness of the verse itself go back to many centuries and rest upon the testimony of the *Mahābhārata-Tālparyā-Nirnaya* an epitome, and running commentary in Sanskrit written by Śrī Madhvācārya about 1300 A.D. So far as our present knowledge goes, this commentary might claim to be the earliest dateable Sanskrit commentary on the Epic.

ii

At the very outset of his *Tālparyanirnaya*, Madhva says that the Epic (of course in the version that he regarded as authentic) opens with the benedictory stanza “नारायणं सुरुक्तं जगदेकनाथं” and proceeds to comment upon this verse in his turn :

ज्ञानप्रदः स भगवान्कमलाविरिचिशर्वादिपूर्वजगतो निखिलाद्विष्टः ।

भक्त्यैव तुष्यति हरिप्रवणत्वमेव सर्वस्य धर्म इति पूर्वविभागसंस्थः ॥ 59 ॥

निर्दोषक सृतिविहीन उदारपूर्णसविबुध प्रथमकृतकलात्मशक्ति ।

मोक्षैकहेतुरसरूपसुरैश्च मुक्तैर्वन्द्य स एक इति चोक्तमथोत्तरार्धे ॥ 60 ॥

नम्यत्वमुक्तमुभयत्र × × × ।

इत्थं हि सर्वगुणपूर्तिरसुख्य विष्णोः प्रस्ताविता प्रथमनः प्रतिजानतेव ॥ 61 ॥

It would be clear from the above, that the verse नारायणं सुरुक्तं could not be Madhva's own (as has been fancied by some) but that in his opinion, it goes back to the original Epic text at least according to the textual tradition inherited by him in the thirteenth century and current in that part of the country (i. e. the South Kanara district and Tulunād of which he was a native). Considering the purity and accuracy with which Kerala and its vicinities have preserved the ancient works of Sanskrit literature which have unfortunately disappeared from the other parts of India, it is not unlikely that the Kerala versions preserve much authentic materials. While it is thus indubitably true that the earliest reference to the verse “नारायणं सुरुक्तम्” is to be found in the metrical commentary of Madhvācārya, he is not certainly the author of it. He makes it clear in his commentary that he regards the verse as belonging to the original nay its very first verse. Furthermore, he is also found to quote the second quarter of this verse in his *Gūṭābhāṣya*, as from the *Mahābhārata* under Gītā IX. 26.

यत्कप्रियं सकललोकनमस्कृतं च इति भारते ॥ and again

केवलो निर्गुणश्च इत्यादि श्रुतिभ्यश्च । “त्रैगुण्यवर्जितम्” (Bharata)

इति श्लोक्तम् IX 13

And we have already seen that this verse is accepted as the opening one in one of the Mes. of the Kerala Recension of the present day. Madhva was himself a native of Tulunād which lies immediately north of Kerala proper and which is part of the

Holy Land of Paraśurāma to which the religious poet Vādirāja pays a graceful compliment :

कर्णे पदन्यस्तकृषी रिरसुर्वाराशिवलं जघनाद्वि यस्या ।
असुचद्वाणकरेण हृमे श्रीमार्गवः सा जयति क्षितिर्न ॥

(*Tirthaprabandha* i).

It is not unlikely that his version was in agreement in the main with the Kerala version, and the South Indian Recension, judging by the criteria proposed by Prof P. P. S. Sastri viz., (1) the exclusion of the Ganeśa episode, to which there is no reference in Madhva or Vādirāja's texts (2) the inclusion of the Kanika episode and (3) the absence of reference to the 8800 enigmatic verses.

अष्टौ श्लोकसहस्राणि अष्टौ श्लोकशतानि च ।

अहं वोद्वि शुको वेत्ति सञ्जयो वेत्ति वा न वा ॥

Madhva not only knew the North Indian version; but claims to have constituted his text after a careful and critical examination of the manuscript material from different parts of the country and upon a 'higher criticism' of the text upon principles which he indicates in the prolegomena to his work. It appears from his statements that he exercised great care and caution in fixing up a Vulgate text of his own after a wide and representative collection of Mss from different parts of India based on different Recensions. It would be well to remember in this connection that his commentary on the Epic was written by him more or less towards the closing part of his life when he had already toured the north and southern parts of India many times and built up a precious library of his own. It may be said of Madhva as of no other ancient writer that he truly and most vividly anticipated the difficulties of modern Research scholars of the Epic and may very properly be described as the pioneer of Mahābhārata text-criticism. He sounds a familiarly modern note

कचिद्वन्थान् प्रक्षिपन्ति कचिदन्तरितानपि ।

कुर्युः कचिच्च व्यन्यास प्रमादात्कचिदभ्यधा ॥ 3 ॥

अनुत्सन्ना अपि ग्रन्था व्याकुला इति सर्वशः ।

देशे देशे तथा ग्रन्थान् दृष्ट्वा चैव पृथग्विधान् ॥ 7 ॥

¹ His date was antedated by three centuries by P. P. S. Sastri. For a complete criticism of P. P. S. Sastri's date and fixation of the real date of Vādirāja see my paper on his date in the *Annals*, B. O. R. I. Vol. XVIII, pp. 187-197

यथा स मगधान्यास' साक्षात्तारायणः प्रभुः ।

जगाद् भारताद्येह तथा वक्ष्ये तदीक्षया ॥ Mbh. TN. II. 8.

it would be obvious that a text so constituted by an ancient writer of his standing deserves greater attention from modern scholars than has been bestowed upon it so far. But so far as his followers were concerned it was naturally this text that was recognised. Vādirāja one of the most eminent followers of Madhva in the sixteenth century commented upon this text in his *Laksālakṣmī* and this commentary, is declared by Prof. P. P. S. Sastri to be based on the South Indian Recension published by him and follow it closely. Prof Sastri seems further to look upon this as testifying to the authenticity and provenness of the text published by him that Vādirāja's प्रतीक should agree with those of his text. By way of illustration of his thesis, he has published Vādirāja's commentary on the Sabhā Parva

It may therefore be pointed out that there are fundamental deviations in Vādirāja from the S. Indian text now published by P. P. S. Sastri. The latter begins straightway without any benedictory verses (मङ्गलाचरण) with the prose text. रोमहर्षणपुत्र उग्र-
श्रवा etc. The North Indian Recension begins with नारायणं¹ नमस्कृत्य
नरं चैव० Prof Sastri holds that the S Indian Recension is right in discarding the usual stereotyped *Mangalācarana* and that a metrical benediction can have really no place at the commencement of the Epic. Be that as it may, the *Laksālakṣmī* has a *very elaborate* commentary on नारायणं सुरगुरुं जगदेकनाथं × × × × × which it regards as the opening benedictory verse of the Epic, following the lead of Madhva's *Tūtparyanirṇaya* in this and in other respects such as the readings of verses and the inclusion of three more benedictory verses in the beginning. It could not be otherwise seeing that Vādirāja was a faithful adherent of Madhva and claims to follow his lead :

नारायणस्य व्यासस्य मध्वस्य च कृपाबलात् ।

भारतश्लोकलक्ष्यालङ्कार. क्रियते मया ॥ I. 5.

Prof. P. P. S. Sastri is not therefore justified in dismissing the verse नारायणं सुरगुरुं + + and Vādirāja's comment on it as an

¹ " Found only in Kashmir L2, D (9. 13 missing) T1 G7 (margin) and very few of Southern MSS.—Telugu and Grantha — " (Suktbankar).

interpolation on the basis of a certain passage: 'अत एवावौ भवणतो माङ्गलिकरोमहर्षणपदापादोनात् न पृथङ्मङ्गलाचरणम्" that is found in certain of the Mss. of *Laksālamkāra* under the words रोमहर्षण-पुत्र उग्रभवाः" It seems far more reasonable to reject this single line as an interpolation than to dismiss the entire and very long comment on the verse नारायणं सुरगुरुम्. The very length and cogency of the passage forbids such a summary disposal. Apart from this, the *Laksālamkāra* comments next upon two other benedictory stanzas of the Epic :

कृष्णो मुक्तैरिज्यते वीतमोहैः कृष्णो यज्ञैरिज्यते सोमधृतैः ।

कृष्णो वीरैरिज्यते विक्रमद्भिः कृष्णो वन्यैरिज्यते संसृक्षानैः ॥

सृष्टा ब्रह्मादयो देवा निहता येन दानवा ।

तस्मै देवाधिदेवाय नमस्ते शार्ङ्गधारिणे ॥

The comment on the first of these: इदानीं "मिद्ध" पदस्य सुप्तपरतां स्पष्टयन् मुक्तामुक्तसकलसज्जनपूज्यो हरिरिवेति वस्तुनिर्देशाय मङ्गलान्तरमाचरति--कृष्णो मुक्तै इति ॥ presupposes the term सिद्ध in सुरसिद्धबन्धुं in the previous verse--वन्दे भवचनममरासुरसिद्धबन्धुम् 1d The comment on the third verse is equally significant विघ्नबाहुल्ये मङ्गलबाहुल्यमिति ध्वनयितुं मङ्गलान्तरमाचारि--'सृष्टा ब्रह्मादयो देवा' इति । अत्र ऋद्धत्वं मुक्तिरदृष्ट्यमेवाभिमतम् ।

After these elaborate comments on the opening verses Vādirāja introduces his commentary on the story proper with following remark :

अधुना कथामारभते--"रोमहर्षण पुत्र उग्रभवा" इत्यादिना ।

Here, the term अधुना is significant and presupposes the existence of some kind of benedictory verses at the outset.

II

The conclusion that Vādirāja did recognize the presence of certain benedictory verses in the beginning of the Epic and that in his opinion the verse नारायणं सुरगुरुम् + + + was the first of that kind is fully attested by his other work the commentary on Madhva's *Mahābhārata-dūtpanyāna-naya* which we have already shown reads नारायणं सुरगुरुं as the first मङ्गलश्लोक of the Epic. Commenting on II. 59 of his original which runs :

ज्ञानप्रदः स भगवान् कमलाविरिचिशर्वादिवर्णजगतो निसिलाद्गिरिः-

x

x

x

Vādirāja writes :— अद्युना भारताद्यप्य एव सर्वोत्तमत्वादि सकलमहिम्ना निरूपितत्वाद्, उपक्रमानुसारेण ग्रन्थस्य योजनीयत्वाद्, लक्षभारतवाक्यान्वयि भगवन्माहात्म्यपराणीति भावेन लोकशिक्षणाय भारतादौ विराचितं मङ्गलपद्यं पठति— नारायणं सुरगुरुं " इति । सुरगुरुमित्यस्यार्थकथनं " कमलाविरिचिशर्वादिवर्णजगतो ज्ञानप्रदः " इति

Now, not only does Vādirāja simply comment on the verse नारायणं सुरगुरुम् as a matter of course; but he also deliberately raises the precise issue we are debating viz. the genuineness and authenticity of the verse नारायणं सुरगुरुम् in question and particularly the need for a benedictory stanza at all. It is gratifying to note that *a la* the modern critical scholar, Vādirāja points to the occurrence of this verse in manuscripts preserved in the " Kerala and other countries " ' कचिदन्तरितानपि ' (Mbh. TN. II. 3^b) इति वचनात् इदमाद्यप्य असहमाना केचिदादौ न लिखन्ति । केरळादिदेशस्थपुस्तकेष्वप्यपि दृश्यते ॥

He also considers it most unlikely that Vyāsa who has incorporated benedictory verses in the beginning of the comparatively shorter works like *Bhūgarata* and *Harvaṃśa* could have failed to do so in such a prodigious work as the *Mahābhārata* कथमन्यथा लोकाचार्यो व्यासः लक्षपरिमितं ग्रन्थं कुर्वन् ग्रन्थादौ लोकशिक्षणाय मङ्गलं न रचयेत् ? यतोऽन्वीयसि ग्रन्थे भागवते हरिवंशादौ च—' सत्यं परं धीमहि ' ' सोऽनादिर्वाह्यदेवः शमयतु दुरितं जन्मजन्मार्जितं नः ' इति लोकशिक्षणार्थं मङ्गलमकरोत् ? अतोऽस्मिन्महाग्रन्थे सकलशिष्टानामग्रणीर्व्यासो मङ्गलमाचरोवेति ज्ञेयम् ॥

(Tulu Ms. Sode Mutt Udipi).

It would thus be evident that the eschewal of benedictory verses from the beginning of the *Mahābhārata* and the omission of " नारायणं सुरगुरुं जगदेकनाथं etc. as the first verse in this connection are sternly discountenanced by Vādirāja and that therefore no S. Indian recension that omits this verse and those that follow, would be acceptable to Madhva and Vādirāja or be recognized by them as representing the authentic (S. Indian) version. In these circumstances, it is dubious if the South Indian version published by Prof. Sastri could be made to rest on the authority of Vādirāja.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE KRṢṆACARITA

BY

JAGAN NATH

In August 1941 Rājavaidya Jivarāma Kālidasa of Gondāl, published, from a fragmentary manuscript of three leaves only what may be described as 'introduction' to a poetical work called the *Kṛṣṇacarita* attributed in the colophon to Mahārāja-dhīrāja Vikramānka Śrī-Samudra Gupta.

The first section of this introduction originally consisted of thirty three verses of which the first twelve are now lost and the remaining twentyone only have been preserved. In this section the author has dealt with the ancient poets whom he designated as *मुनिकवयः* (sage poets). In this section the following authors and works are mentioned.—

1 Śāṅkhāyana — He wrote a poem called *Kaṇthābharana*.

2 Vararuci — He wrote a *Kāvya* named *Svargārohana*.

3 Kātyāyana — He not only wrote the *Vārtikas* on Pāṇini's Grammar, but also followed in his footsteps in writing poetry. His work is not mentioned.

4 Vyādi :— He is described as a poet, and philosopher of the Mīmāṃsā school. He wrote a *Mahākāvya* called the *Bāhucarita* which excelled the *Mahabhārata* of Vyāsa.

5 Devala :— the author of *Indravijaya*

6 Patañjali — He is the author of the great commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar. He revised the *Samhitā* of Caraka, and wrote a poem called *योगदर्शन* containing an exposition of the Yoga system of Philosophy. This work appears to be distinct from the well known Sūtra treatise of the same name.

7 Bhāsa :— the author of a brilliant *Mahākāvya*, and twenty plays. He wrote a play named *Vāsavadattā*, and made the *Rāmāyana* and *Mahābhārata* more enjoyable by dramatising their story and adding various episodes of his own making. Other poets imitated him in writing plays. He did not completely follow Pāṇini's system of grammar.

8 Vardhamāna :— the author of *Bhīmajaya*.

9 Cīnadeva .— He was a foreigner. He wrote both in *Māgadhī* and *Sanskrit*, a poem called the *Buddhacarita*.

10 Mihiradeva.—He was a Persian. He wrote a panegyric of the god sun in one hundred *śikharinī* verses.

These are the ten sage-poets to whom the author paid his tribute, by recording their names and the works they had written.

The second section deals with the royal poets and the following names are mentioned :—

1 Subandhu.—He is described as a court poet of King Bindusāra whose displeasure he incurred and was thrown into the prison. By the favour of Goddess Sarasvatī, he managed to escape from the prison and went to king Vatsarāja, who gave him five villages and the hand of his sister. He wrote a poem called Vatsarājacarita, and an unnamed play.

2 Śūdraka:—Equal to Indra in valour, he performed an *atvameṭha* sacrifice and having overthrown the Śakas started his own era called the Vikrama era. He wrote treatises on the science of archery and stealing. He was the author of two plays. He also composed the Mrechakatika in nine acts. In this work he described his own exploits. This work became known as Āryakajaya. Having placed his son Devamitra on the throne he retired to the forest.

3 Kālidāsa:—At Śūdraka's court was the great poet Kālidāsa who composed a play dealing with the love romance of king Dusyanta. Besides this, he wrote three minor plays.

4 Sūra — A Buddhist scholar, author of two Mahākāvyas the Saunanda and the Buddhacarita. His other name was Ghosa. He wrote treatises on the exposition of Buddhist doctrine. He also took part in a great congregation of Buddhist teachers.

5 Hariscandra.—He was the king of Pāñcāla and wrote a work called *Karnakīrtti*.

6 Mārgupta — He was not only a *Kaṁvāja* but also a king, who had obtained the kingdom of Kashmir through the favour of the goddess Sarasvatī.

7 Āvantika — Author of Śūdrakajaya.

8 Harisena alias Kālidāsa or Raghukāra:—He held the exalted position of Minister of Samudragupta and was the supreme authority in matters of peace and war. He was styled Kumārasaciva. He acted as Brahmin priest at the sacrificial performances of his royal patron. He wrote the Raghuvamśa and four

other minor poems. He prevailed upon the king to write the *Kṛṣṇacarita*.

The section ends with the account of these eight royal poets. In the colophon this section is designated as राजकविकीर्तन in the कथाप्रस्तावना of कृष्णचरित composed by Śrī Vikramāṅka Mahārājādhirāja Paramabhāgavata Śrī Samudra Gupta

The information supplied by this manuscript is interesting, as it has the charm of novelty. Some of the names of authors and works are quite familiar, others are less commonly known like Vyādi, while some are altogether new. Some of the statements made in this work are in conflict with quite well-known and well-established facts of political and literary history of ancient India. These require a careful examination.

Firstly, it has been stated about Subandhu that he fled from the imprisonment of Bindusāra and went to Vatsarāja who gave him shelter. Thus according to this work Bindusāra and Vatsarāja Udayana were contemporaries, which is an impossibility, since Udayana flourished long before the establishment of the Maurya empire. It may be argued that this Vatsarāja may not be Udayana but a different monarch of later times. But this much at least must be conceded that only an independent and powerful king could have dared to give protection to Subandhu who had incurred the displeasure of Bindusāra. Now Bindusāra was an imperial sovereign whose dominions included the whole of Northern India, and parts of the Deccan. The small kingdoms into which India had been divided in the days of Buddha, had all been swept away by the rising power of Magadha. Therefore there can be no possibility of an independent contemporary of Bindusāra, who could thus openly flout the wishes of the Maurya sovereign with impunity. We know from the Greek accounts that Bindusāra was a ruler of stern disposition who never spared his enemies as his title of *Amulrochales* shows. Therefore no vassal rulers could have dared to offend such an overlord. This statement of the present work is therefore, opposed to the facts of history.

Secondly the work mentions two Kālidāsas—one the contemporary of Śudraka Vikramāditya and author of the plays *Śakuntalā*, etc. and the other Harisena, the Foreign Minister of Samudragupta and the author of *Raghuvamśa* and other poems. However the internal evidence of the works themselves shows that the author of *Śakuntalā*, *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārsambhava* and

Meghadūta is one and the same person. The following close similarities in thought and expression clearly prove the common authorship of the plays and poems.

1. *Sakuntalā*, II, 5
मेदच्छेदकशोदरं लघु भवत्युत्थानयोग्य
वयुः
सस्वानामपि लक्ष्यते विकृतिमाश्चित भय-
क्रोधयोः ॥
उत्कर्षं स च धन्विनां यदिषवः सिध्यन्ति
लक्ष्ये चले
मिथ्यैव व्यसनं वदन्ति सुगयामीदृग्वि-
नोद कुतः ॥
2. *Sakuntalā*, I, 6 c and d
सुगानुसारिणं साक्षात्पश्यामीव पिना-
किनम् ।
3. *Sakuntalā*, III, 10
स्मर एव तापहेतुर्निर्वापयिता स एव मे
जात
दिवस इवाभ्रश्यामस्तपात्यये जीवलोरुस्थः ॥
4. *Sakuntalā*, IV, 4 cd
अवेहि तनयां ब्रह्मसृष्टिगर्भां कामीमिव ।
5. *Sakuntalā*, IV, 12.
उन्नलितरुर्भकबला सुगमः परित्यक्तनर्तना
मधुरा ।
अपसृतपाण्डुपत्रा मुखान्त्यश्रुणीव लता ॥
6. *Sakuntalā*, V, 2.
रम्पाणि वीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशम्य शब्दान्
पर्णुस्तुको भवति यत्सुखितोऽपि जन्तुः ।
तच्चेतसा स्मरति हनमचोषपूर्वं
भावस्थिराणि जननान्तरसौहृदानि ॥
7. *Sakuntalā*, VII, 34.
तव भवतु विद्वीजा प्राज्यदृष्टिः प्रजामु-
त्सवमपि विततयज्ञो वज्रिण प्रीणयस्व ।
युगशतपरिवर्तनिवमन्योन्यकृत्यै-
र्नयतस्तुभयलोकादुग्रहश्लाघनीयैः ॥
8. *Sakuntalā*, V, 6^b
क्लिञ्जाति लब्धपरिपालनवृत्तिरेव ।
1. *Raghuvamśa*, IX, 49.
परिचयं चललक्ष्यनिपातने
भयरूपोश्च तद्विद्वितबोधनम् ।
अमजयात् प्रगुणा च करोत्यसौ
तनुमतोऽनुमतः सचिवैर्ययौ ॥
2. *Raghuvamśa*, XI, 44 cd.
विद्वत्कतुसुगानुसारिण येन बाणमसृजद्
दृषध्वजः ।
3. *Raghuvamśa*, X, 83.
ते प्रजानां प्रजानाधास्तेजसा प्रभ्रयेण च ।
मनो जह्नुर्निदाघान्ते श्यामाभ्रा विभक्ता
इव ॥
4. *Raghuvamśa*, III, 9.
शमीमिवाभ्यन्तरलीनपावकाश्च ।
सुव' समस्त्रां महिषीममन्यत ॥
5. *Raghuvamśa*, XIV, 69.
सुत्यं मर्त्या कृतमानि वृक्षा दर्भास्तृपानान्
विजहृर्हरिण्य ।
तस्या प्रपन्ने समदुःखभावमन्यन्तमासी
दुदितं घनेऽपि ॥
6. *Raghuvamśa*, XI, 22.
वामनाभ्रमपद् तत परं
पावनं श्रुतसृपेरुपेयिवान् ।
उन्मना प्रथमजन्मचेष्टितान्य-
स्मरन्नापि बभूव राघव ॥
7. *Raghuvamśa*, I, 26.
दुदोह गां स यज्ञाय सस्याय मधवा
द्विषम् ।
सपङ्क्तिनिमयेनोभौ दधतुर्धुवनद्वयम् ॥
8. *Raghuvamśa*, XIX, 3 a.
लब्धपालनविधौ न तत्सुत खेदमाप ।

These parallellisms in thought and expression strongly indicate] that the author of the *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* and the *Raghuvamśa* is [one and the same person. Besides these there are many other instances of the use of similar constructions and ideas to be found in the plays and the poems. For instance the poet is very fond of the construction क क. In the *Raghuvamśa* we have क सूर्यप्रभवो वक्ष क चाल्पविषया मतिः । In the *Meghadūta* we have धूमज्योतिः मलिलमकृतां साक्षिवातः क मेघ', मन्देशार्था क पट्टकरणे प्राणिभिः प्रेक्षणीयाः । A similar construction we have in the *Śakuntalā*, क वत हरिणकानां जीवन चातिलोल, क च निशितनिपाताः वज्रसारा शरास्ते । and क वयं क परोक्षमन्मथो युगशिवैः सममेधितो जन ॥ Again, the mention of the mango tree and the *Navamālīkā* creeper together and comparing them to a youth and a maiden is a common idea in the *Raghuvamśa* and the *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*, as may be seen from the following instances

मिथुनं परिकल्पितं त्वया सहकार कलिनी च नन्दिमौ ।

Raghuvamśa, VIII, 61.

चूतेन संभितवती नवमालिकेयं । *Śakuntalā*, IV, 13

इयं स्वयंवरवधूं, सहकारस्य त्वया कृतनामधेया वनज्योत्येति नवमालिका ।

Śakuntalā, I.

Further the use of the root आ √ वृश् in the sense of pouring out has been made frequently in these works —

1. इति कलशमावर्जयति । *Śakuntalā*, I.

2. आवर्जिताष्टापद्भुम्भतोये । *Kumārasambhava*, VII, 10.

3. त्वदावर्जितवारिः समूतश्च । *Kumārasambhava*, V, 34.

The community of thought and expression between the plays and the poems, conclusively proves, that all of them are written by the same author. The suggestion of two *Kālidāsa*s, one the author of the plays and the other the author of the *Mahākāvya*s is absolutely baseless and in conflict with the evidence of the works themselves. It would not be too much to suggest that the author of this fragment has merely versified some of the recent suggestions, e. g. *Jayaśamkara Prasad*, put forward the theory of two *Kālidāsa*'s in his *Skandagupta*.

It is further to be noted that *Harisena*, the author of the *Allahabad pillar inscription* can never be the author of the *Raghuvamśa*. There is a fundamental difference in the tempera-

ment of the two. While the author of the *Raghuvamśa* is absolutely uncommunicative about his personality—so much so that he does not mention even his name in the poem—Harisena has not only mentioned his name as the author of the inscription but has also given many details about himself such as the name of his father, the name of his native place, his official title and the offices he held. Is it too much to expect that he would have himself stated that he was known as a second Kālidāsa if he really was?

These verses which have been passed by its author whoever he is as the introduction to the poem *Kṛṣṇacarita*, are *prima facie* a forgery, an attempt to weave the scattered information concerning ancient authors into one piece.¹ To endow it with authenticity, the name of Samudragupta has been invented. It is clearly intended to provide '*fresh evidence*' for solving some of the puzzles in the history of Sanskrit literature and the political history of ancient India, such as the authorship of the *Mecchakatika* the authenticity of the Trivandrum plays, the date of Kālidāsa, the origin of the Vikrama Era, etc etc.

¹ The reference to the association of Subandhu with Bindusāra is to be found in the *Avantisundarikathā*, the account of Śudraka is taken from the *Mecchakatika* with minor additions, the mention of Rāmila and Somila is found in an oft quoted verse.

A NEW INTERPRETATION of the expression,

शिलाघनमध्यस्थप्रदीपमहस्रकथन, in Śamkara's commentary on

Br. Sū I, ii 28

BY

SHRINIVAS DIXIT

All the commentators and interpreters of Śamkara seem to have missed the real significance of this expression when they unanimously agree in interpreting it thus "that to say an idea, like a lamp, reveals itself spontaneously without standing in need of anything else to illumine it, — it is tantamount to asserting that the idea, which no means-of-proof can ever reveal, needs also no percipient for its perception, as though a thousand lamps blazing in the interior of some rock were to make themselves manifest therein." Now what is the significance of the analogy of the lamps in the interior of a stone here? In order to understand this, let us know the drift of the passage

The Vijñānavādin says that only ideas exist. Why? For, they alone are immediately perceived, while the objects as such being presumably of the nature of non-knowledge can never enter the field of consciousness. Whatever is known, is known, and therefore an idea, and whatever is unknown, is totally unknown, and therefore cannot be known to exist. This means the same thing as to say that the object lacking illumination (i. e., a relation to consciousness or the status of being an idea, in our modern terminology) can never be known, while an idea having illumination (i. e. a relation to consciousness) can alone be the object of knowledge.

To this, Śamkara replies, even an idea must require an illumination from some external source. (The neo-realist may well understand by this that an entity becomes an idea when it enters a certain relation)

The Buddhist reply to this is: "I recognize ideas as self-luminous". This is the position that Hume had arrived at in declaring that the whole world is an unceasing flux of ideas. For, Hume also had tentatively suggested that there may be ideas which are not ideas of anybody.

Śamkara's answer to this is, शिलाघनमध्यस्थप्रदीपसहस्रकथनवत्. It is quite apt if we expand it thus "By saying that there can be ideas without being known (अनवगन्तुकं विज्ञानं), you are taking away the very differentia of an idea. On your hypothesis everything will be an idea. But it would only mean that what we call a thing you choose to designate as an idea. But, surely, for that reason it becomes an *idle hypothesis*, as idle and barren as to hypothesize a thousand candles burning in the interior of a stone. The hypothesis makes no difference to the things that can be verified. Even if there were no lamps burning there, or there were ten thousand instead of one thousand, the things would be the same. Similarly, if there were ideas without being known, there will be no difference between our world view and your world view. The only difference is that you call the things of the world ideas and we call them objects. Then the designation 'idea' will be pointless. But there will be sense in calling the objects ideas, not at all times, but only when they receive illumination (i. e. they enter into a relation with consciousness)"

This sort of interpretation will credit Śamkara with anticipating the arguments of modern neo-realism according to which a thing becomes an idea without losing its identity as an object by entering a new relation. An object is an idea not by reason of its stuff but due to its function. Śamkara certainly, though vaguely, implies this. For, otherwise the analogy of 'unknown ideas' with 'lamps in the interior of a stone' has nothing in common. The lamps in the interior of a stone will still be lamps, while the unknown ideas will not be ideas in any significant sense. That the lamps will not illumine other objects is beside the point. That proves nothing. They will be as good lamps as any that there be. Yet this is how the expression is traditionally interpreted. On that interpretation, there is no analogy whatsoever. But by his *an*, Śamkara clearly means an analogy.

That my meaning was implied by Śamkara is clear from the fact that he does not say that there is an analogy between the rock-hidden lamps and the unknown ideas, but between *saying* (वचता) that unknown ideas exist and *telling* (कथयन्वत्) that a thousand lamps burn in the interior of a massive stone. The analogy is between the general character of the hypotheses as such (i. e. both of them are idle) and not between the specific assertions made therein.

That Śamkara did not much develop such a realistic flash is unfortunate. Had he done so, he would have been the founder of modern realism. For that, it would not have been necessary for him to abandon his ब्रह्मकारणवाद. Epistemological realism is quite compatible with an ontological idealism

BOOK RECEIVED

दत्तोपंत आपटे लेखसंग्रह, दत्तोपंत आपटे
स्मारक संकलन, पुणे, १९४५.

Bahāullāh and New Era,
(Marathi), translated by V. S.
Apte, New Delhi, 1945.

An Introduction to the Study of
Srimad Bhagavad Gītā, by
R. Vasudeva Row, Suddha
Dharma Office, Mylapore,
Madras.

Bharatiya Vidya (Vol. V),
Miscellany, A. D. Pusalker,
Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan,
Bombay, 1945.

भारतीय-युद्ध-काल निर्णय, by R. V.
Vaidya, M. G. Gadgkari,
Lashkar, (Gwalior), 1945.

Bibliography of Indological
Studies, 1942, George M.
Moraes, Konkan Institute of
Arts and Sciences, Bombay,
1945.

Descriptive Catalogue of the
Sanskrit Manuscripts in
H. H. The Maharajah's Palace
Library, Trivandrum,
Volumes II-VIII.

Descriptive Catalogue of the
Sanskrit Manuscripts in the
Curator's Office Library,
Trivandrum, Volumes III-X.

दुर्गा सप्तशती, राजवैद्य जीवराज
कालिदासशास्त्री, गोंडाळ, संवत् २००१.

Eski Hind Tarihi, Walter
Ruben, Ankara, 1944.

Mahatma Hansaraja, by
Khushahalahachanda Ananda,
Pradhan, Arya Pradeshika
Pratinidhi Sabha, Lahore.

Proceedings of the Indian
History Congress, Seventh
Session, held at Madras 1944,
General Secretary, Indian
History Congress, Allahabad

Proceedings of the Indian
History Congress, Seventh
Session, Madras University,
Madras, General Secretary,
Indian History Congress,
Allahabad.

Invisches Mittelalter, Walter
Ruben, Istanbul, 1944.

Investigations into Prehistoric
Archaeology of Gujarat, by
H. D. Sankalia, Sri Pratapa-
simha Maharaja, Rajya-
bhisheka Grantha Mala,
Baroda, 1946.

Jainism and Meat-Eating, by
M V. Shah, All India Shwe.
Sthanakwasi Jain Conference,
Bombay.

Kashmiri Lyrics, by J. L. Kaul,
Rinemisray Srinagar,
Kashmir, 1945.

Kautaliya Arthasāstra with
Malayālam Commentary
(Adhikaraṇa 3) Part III,
V. A. Ramaswami Sastri,
Trivandrum, 1945.

- University of Madras, Calendar for 1945-46 Vol. I Parts I, II, University of Madras, Madras, 1946.
- Le Monde Oriental Revue, Des Etudes Orientales, Vols. XXX-XXXII, H. S. Nyberg, 1936-1938, London.
- Nyāyakusumāñjali of Udayanācārya, Vol. I, Books I, II, Swami Ravi Tirtha, Adyar Library, Adyar, 1946.
- History of Orissa by L. N. Sahu, Poona, 1946.
- Kasaratnāpradīpikā of Allarāja, R N Dandekar, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945.
- Self-Realisation, Life and Teachings of Bhagavan Shri Ramana Maharshi, B. V. Narasimha Swami, Tiruvannamalai, 1944.
- Suddha Rāja Yoga of Sri Hamsa-yogi, T. A. M. Janardanam, Suddha Dharma office, Mylapore, Madras
- Tantrasamuccaya of Nārāyana Part I, V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, University of Travancore, Trivandrum, 1945
- The Legend of the Topes, by B. C. Law, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1945.
- श्रीवल्लभराम शालिग्राम सांगवेदविद्यालय
रजतजयन्ती, श्रीदेवनायक आचार्य,
काशी, वि. संवत् २००२
- श्रीवल्लभराम शालिग्राम सांगवेदविद्यालय.
रजतजयन्ती महोत्सव का कार्य-विवरण
श्रीदेवनायक आचार्य, काशी,
वि संवत् २००२.
- A Vedic Word-Concordance, Vol. III, (Upanisads) Parts I (अ-न) and II (ण-ह), Visva-Bandhu Sāstri, V. V. R. Institute, Lahore, 1945.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

Mahabharata Volumes already published

Rs. As.

Vol I-Ādīparvan (1), ed , Dr V S Sukthankar, M A , Ph D , Fasc 1-7 , pp cxviii + 996	33 0
Vol II-Sabhāparvan (2), ed , Prof Dr F Edgerton , Fasc 13-14 , pp lxxvii + 517	12 0
Vols III & IV-Āranyakaparvan (3) ed , Dr V S Sukthankar, M A , Ph D , Fasc 11-12 , pp xlii + 1111	18 0
Vol V-Vīrataparvan (4), ed , Dr Raghu Vira, M A , Ph D , Fasc 8 pp lx + 362	11 0
Vol VI-Udyogaparvan (5), ed , Dr S K De, M A , D Litt , Fasc 9 10 , pp liv + 739	19 0
Vol VII-Bhīsmāparvan (6), ed , Dr S K Belvalkar, M A , Ph D , Fasc 15 pp 392	8 0

Volumes in press

Vol VII- Fasc 16 - ed. Dr. S. K.

Belv

बोर सेवा मन्दिर

पुस्तकालय

Ta rikh

ediv

ly

No

बाल न०

- Dechhut & N

Nirul t

Vo

(B

Descri

Li

Vol II

Be

Vol X

by

Vol X

P

P

Progre

se

d

c

d